



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>













J. Allard sc.

THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM SKINNER, D.D.

*Bishop of Aberdeen,
and
Primate of the Scottish Episcopal Church*

London: J. Longman & Co. Warwick Square

THE
HISTORY
OF THE
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,
FROM THE
Reformation to the Present Time.

BY
THOMAS STEPHEN,

RECTOR, ABERDEEN, KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON;

AUTHOR OF "THE DOGS OF THE CONSTITUTION," "THE GUIDE TO THE MORNING AND EVENING SERVICE
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND," ETC. ETC.

VOL. IV.

LONDON:
JOHN LENDRUM, 7, WARWICK SQUARE;
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.;
AND TO BE HAD OF ALL BOOKSELLERS.

MDCCCXLV.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

WILSON AND OGILVY, SKINNER STREET, SNOWHILL.

CONTENTS.

	Page
CHAPTER LIX.	
Administration of the Right Rev. Alexander Rose, D.D.—1704 to 1707	1
CHAPTER LX.	
_____ the Right Rev. Alexander Rose, D.D.—1707 to 1710	27
CHAPTER LXI.	
_____ the Right Rev. Alexander Rose, D.D.—1710 to 1714	59
CHAPTER LXII.	
_____ the Right Rev. Alexander Rose, D.D.—1714 to 1720	106
CHAPTER LXIII.	
_____ the Rt. Rev. John Fullarton—1720 to 1723 ..	159
CHAPTER LXIV.	
_____ the Rt. Rev. John Fullarton—1723 to 1727 ..	216
CHAPTER LXV.	
_____ the Right Rev. Arthur Millar—1727	246
CHAPTER LXVI.	
_____ the Rt. Rev. Andrew Lumsden—1727 to 1733	256
CHAPTER LXVII.	
Primacy of the Right Rev. David Freebairn—1733 to 1799 ...	270
CHAPTER LXVIII.	
_____ the Right Rev. Thomas Rattray—1739 to 1743 ...	284
CHAPTER LXIX.	
_____ the Right Rev. Robert Keith—1743 to 1745	293
CHAPTER LXX.	
_____ the Right Rev. Robert Keith—1745 to 1748	317

	Page
CHAPTER LXXI.	
Primacy of the Right Rev. Robert Keith—1749 to 1757	344
CHAPTER LXXII.	
———— the Right Rev. Robert White—1757 to 1761	368
CHAPTER LXXIII.	
———— the Right Rev. William Falconar—1762 to 1781.....	377
CHAPTER LXXIV.	
———— the Right Rev. Robert Kilgour—1782 to 1788	394
CHAPTER LXXV.	
———— the Right Rev. John Skinner—1789 to 1792	419
CHAPTER LXXVI.	
———— the Right Rev. John Skinner—1792 to 1799	435
CHAPTER LXXVII.	
———— the Right Rev. John Skinner—1800 to 1804	452
CHAPTER LXXVIII.	
———— the Right Rev. John Skinner—1804 to 1816	471
CHAPTER LXXIX.	
———— the Right Rev. George Gleig, LL. D.—1816 to 1829	494
CHAPTER LXXX.	
———— the Right Rev. George Gleig, LL. D.—1830 to 1837	518
CHAPTER LXXXI.	
———— the Rt. Rev. James Walker, D.D.—1837 to 1838 ..	543
CHAPTER LXXXII.	
———— the Right Rev. James Walker, D.D.—1838 to 1841	556
CHAPTER LXXXIII.	
———— the Right Rev. William Skinner, D.D.,—1841 to 1842	585
CHAPTER LXXXIV.	
———— the Right Rev. William Skinner, D.D.—1843.....	605
CHAPTER LXXXV.	
———— the Right Rev. William Skinner.....	620
Appendix.....	648
Index	653

THE
HISTORY
OF THE
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

CHAPTER LIX.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RIGHT REV. ALEXANDER ROSE, D.D.
VICAR GENERAL OF THE PROVINCE OF ST. ANDREWS.

1704.—Bishop Rose's administration.—Remarks on the office of primus.—The persecution proceeds.—Mr. Burgess attacked.—Breach of a safe conduct.—A procession at Edinburgh.—Some sacred utensils burnt.—Remarks.—Parliament.—1705.—Consecration of Sage and Fullarton.—Deed of consecration.—Remarks.—An Assembly.—Dr. Carstares.—John Hepburn—his deposition—the Occasions.—Dissolution of the Assembly.—Session of Parliament.—1706.—An Assembly.—Union proposed.—Commissioners.—The affairs of the church misrepresented to the queen.—The treaty of union.—The episcopal chapels shut up.—The kirk in danger.—Session of parliament.—Petition from the commission against the union.—Popular dislike to the union.—Act of security.—1707.—UNION concluded.—A remonstrance.—Remarks.—English act of security.—Treaty ratified by both parliaments.—Scottish parliament dissolved—previous attempts at an union—by marriage—by conquest.—Attempts subsequent to the accession of James VI.—Arts of the jesuits—considered as a punishment.—Provocations.—Union of the churches.—The three national churches become one British church.

1704.—IT HAS BEEN asserted by a modern author¹, that bishop Rose, after the death of the primate in 1704, exercised metropolitan authority under the ancient Scottish title of *primus Scotiæ episcopus*. The assertion is totally unfounded.

¹ Lawson's History of the Scottish Episcopal Church, p. 81.

He never bore such a title. He acted in the supreme government of the church as vicar-general of St. Andrews *sede vacante*, and his primacy was acknowledged and submitted to by the other bishops and clergy; though the precise ground on which he claimed vicarial power, if indeed he put forth such a claim, is by no means clearly ascertained. It has been generally taken for granted, that he had and exercised the vicariate in right of his see. There is, however, no shadow of such prerogative in the charter of erection;—"precedence" is granted to the bishop of Edinburgh "next after the archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, and before all the other bishops of our foresaid kingdom;" but no intimation that the rights of a metropolitan were to devolve upon him during the vacancy of St. Andrews. He seems rather to have claimed the supreme government as sole survivor of those bishops who had been appointed by the crown. It was maintained that *jurisdiction* could emanate only from the civil power, and for that reason the persons who were assumed into the episcopal order after the Revolution were consecrated without a title. They had no diocese, no jurisdiction, no flock; they were simply "bishops at large." The notion of calling one of their number *Primus*, seems to have originated with the "College bishops," as a device to save the principle of the royal supremacy; just as the kingdom was afterwards parcelled out into districts, lest the bishops should be thought to claim a legal title to the ancient dioceses. The views and principles of the two parties were brought out in the disputes of 1727, to be afterwards narrated. In the terms of agreement proposed by the diocesan bishops to the "College" party, it is laid down in the first article,—“Seeing there can be no order or unity preserved in any national or provincial church without a metropolitan—that all do own bishop Millar for bishop of Edinburgh, and that as vicar-general the metropolitcal powers are lodged in him.” To this their opponents answered, that “order and unity may very well be preserved without a metropolitan, by such a power as we are satisfied to confer. . . . Though bishop Millar had been most regularly elected by all the presbyters unanimously, and duly confirmed by the college of bishops, all this could not have conferred on him a metropolitcal power. The reasons we are not obliged to give, nor is it proper, at this season.” There can be no doubt, however, that they alluded to the necessity of an exercise of the royal supremacy, in order to confer *jurisdiction*. The title of *primus* was formally sanctioned by the Concordate of 1732, Art. IV., and so far the principle of the “college bishops”

was conceded to them, and a farther step made to that false position in which the Scottish bishops have stood ever since. A precedent for this title has been sought in the practice of the Scottish church at a remote period, when the bishop of St. Andrews, instead of bearing the title of archbishop, was styled "*primus, or maximus Scotorum episcopus*¹." Reference has also been made to a custom in a portion of the African church, where the primacy, instead of being fixed to a particular see, belonged to the senior bishop². Neither of these instances, however, correspond exactly to the modern Scotch practice, for in both the *Primus* really had the power of a metropolitan, and, besides, they are so obscure and uncertain in their authenticity, as scarcely to warrant a deviation from the usage of universal christendom.

OUT OF THIRTEEN prelates that were ejected from their sees in 1688, only five now remained alive, viz. Paterson, archbishop of Glasgow; Rose, bishop of Edinburgh; Haliburton, of Aberdeen; Hay, of Moray; and Douglas, of Dunblane. There does not appear to have been any synod or other meeting of these venerable prelates; but Mr. Skinner says, they "came to an unanimous resolution of continuing the apostolic succession." This resolution, however, was not put in execution till January next year. By the merciful providence of God, the *sting* had been taken out of the presbyterian excommunications, and therefore these persecuted prelates were permitted to remain in the kingdom, which the fear of death compelled their excommunicated predecessors of the Spottiswood line to quit; and so not only to keep fast "that good thing which was committed unto them by the Holy Ghost," but to "commit the same to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."

THE PERSECUTION of the church still went on with the same ruthless malice as before, and the following letter, addressed to Dr. Leslie, is an instance of the toleration and comprehension which the presbyterian leaders assured the queen that the Scottish clergy enjoyed. It is dated Edinburgh, February 1st, 1703-4. "Master Massie, a Scottish gentleman, living within nine miles of Edinburgh, sent for Mr. Burgess, an episcopal minister, to baptize his child: the presbyterian preacher of the parish commanded his parishioners to rise, under pain of excommunication, and to thrust out that intruder, as he called him. Whereupon a great many people came to Mr. Massie's house, where they not only abused his wife, who was

¹ Spottiswood's History, p. 24.

² Bingham's Antiq. b. ii. c. xvi. § vi.

very ill, and still lying in child-bed, but also tore all the minister's clothes, beat him most unmercifully, and with much ado were persuaded to let him have an old coat, and so be gone. He was twice beset on the road, with a design to kill him with stones, but it pleased God to preserve his life. Observe that Mr. Burgess hath complied with the government, and served as chaplain in king William's regiments¹."

THE MASSACRE of Glencoe was unspeakably disgraceful to king William's reign; but in the present we have an instance of breach of trust in the presbyterian council that outshines even the council of Constance. The privy council gave a *safe conduct* to sir Alexander Macdonald of Glengarry, a relation of that Mr. Macdonald of Glencoe, who had been murdered under trust, to come to Edinburgh by a certain day, and the safe conduct was to continue in force for fifteen days. Upon the assurance of this pledge of the public faith, he came up accordingly; yet no sooner did he arrive than the council committed him close prisoner to the Castle! He pleaded his safe conduct there and home; but they despised it, and most treacherously committed him². This is the conduct that, in the council of Constance, has deservedly met with universal reprobation from all parties; yet I cannot see that such treachery is more worthy of execration in a popish council than in a presbyterian government. However, another occurrence this year marks the character of that religion for reverence for sacred things and respect for our Lord and Saviour, the only "Head and King of the church," as they speak. It is conveyed in a letter from one of those patient confessors who was an eye-witness of this national sin. The letter is dated Edinburgh, April 5th, 1704, and is addressed to Dr. Leslie. The signature does not appear, for that would have been high treason, and would have endangered the writer:—

"THE 15TH DAY of March last, being Wednesday, the weekly market day at Edinburgh, there was a procession brought from the low council-house, by the way of the tol-booth, and in view of the market people, and along the Lucken-Booths to the cross, *by order of her majesty's privy-council*, which was our blessed Saviour's picture in *taille-douce* [copper-plate] upon the cross: this was carried upon the point of a halbert by a town officer. The *hangman* and his man followed after, both arrayed in *priests' vestments*, with crucifixes upon their foreheads, and every one of the officers

¹ Rehearsals, App. to Cassandra, vi. p. 239.

² Ibid. vi. p. 247

carried something. In this manner they came to the cross, where there was a fire prepared, into which they put our blessed Lord's picture, the priests' vestments, the crucifixes, together with some *consecrated wafers*, the vulgar Latin Bible, and some other books, and burnt them all! They beat the sides of the chalice together, and having thrown it into the fire, they took *it* out again, pretending they would sell it, and give it to the poor¹."

DR. LESLIE asserts, that he made particular inquiries into the truth of this horrible sacrilege, as it is not easy to believe that such an insult to our Lord and our God could have been done in a professedly christian country; and he adds, "I have it from *undoubted* hands, and can now give it to the reader for a *certain truth*." All christian churches retain our Lord's own words, and call the elements His Body and Blood, and even the presbyterians themselves "call them by the names of the things they represent; to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ²." Because Christ has not revealed the *manner* of this holy mystery, therefore no church can or ought to define it; but that is the *sin* of the Roman church, which does presume to define what Christ himself chose to leave a mystery. Nevertheless, the sacrament being duly consecrated, is acknowledged by all christians to be the Body of Christ in a mysterious manner: now, to take the symbol of His sacred Body, and to burn it by the hands of the common hangman, is an insult to Christ such as no heathen would have offered to their false gods. To crucify the picture of Our Saviour, to thrust a spear into its side, and to burn it by the hands of the common hangman, is to crucify Christ in effigy, and is as great a contempt of Him as any Jew or Musselman could have shewn³. The common test in Japan for a christian is the trampling on the cross, which none but the Dutch presbyterians will do; yet they were outdone by their brethren in Scotland, who burnt the symbol of their salvation by the hands of the common hangman. The chalice and the priest's vestments were things solemnly dedicated to God's service, and separated to holy uses. But "the profan-

¹ Cassandra, Append. Rehearsals, vi. 261.

² Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. xxix. sec. 5, 7, pp. 164, 165.

³ The bishops that assembled in council at Constantinople, in the year 754, condemned the making pictures or images of Christ; "for, as they argued, He being God as well as man, it was impossible to represent Him by an image; for either the image would represent *only* His manhood, which would not be Christ, but merely a *division* of the two natures which are in Him, or otherwise it must be supposed that the incomprehensible Deity was comprehended by the lines of human flesh: in either case the guilt of blasphemy would be incurred."—*Perceval's Roman Schism*, p. 77.

very ill, and still lying in child-bed, but also tore all the minister's clothes, beat him most unmercifully, and with much ado were persuaded to let him have an old coat, and so be gone. He was twice beset on the road, with a design to kill him with stones, but it pleased God to preserve his life. Observe that Mr. Burgess hath complied with the government, and served as chaplain in king William's regiments¹."

THE MASSACRE of Glencoe was unspeakably disgraceful to king William's reign; but in the present we have an instance of breach of trust in the presbyterian council that outshines even the council of Constance. The privy council gave a *safe conduct* to sir Alexander Macdonald of Glengarry, a relation of that Mr. Macdonald of Glencoe, who had been murdered under trust, to come to Edinburgh by a certain day, and the safe conduct was to continue in force for fifteen days. Upon the assurance of this pledge of the public faith, he came up accordingly; yet no sooner did he arrive than the council committed him close prisoner to the Castle! He pleaded his safe conduct there and home; but they despised it, and most treacherously committed him². This is the conduct that, in the council of Constance, has deservedly met with universal reprobation from all parties; yet I cannot see that such treachery is more worthy of execration in a popish council than in a presbyterian government. However, another occurrence this year marks the character of that religion for reverence for sacred things and respect for our Lord and Saviour, the only "Head and King of the church," as they speak. It is conveyed in a letter from one of those patient confessors who was an eye-witness of this national sin. The letter is dated Edinburgh, April 5th, 1704, and is addressed to Dr. Leslie. The signature does not appear, for that would have been high treason, and would have endangered the writer:—

"THE 15TH DAY of March last, being Wednesday, the weekly market day at Edinburgh, there was a procession brought from the low council-house, by the way of the tol-booth, and in view of the market people, and along the Lucken-Booths to the cross, *by order of her majesty's privy-council*, which was our blessed Saviour's picture in *taille-douce* [copper-plate] upon the cross: this was carried upon the point of a halbert by a town officer. The *hangman* and his man followed after, both arrayed in *priests' vestments*, with crucifixes upon their foreheads, and every one of the officers

¹ Rehearsals, App. to Cassandra, vi. p. 239.

² Ibid. vi. p. 247

carried something. In this manner they came to the cross, where there was a fire prepared, into which they put our blessed Lord's picture, the priests' vestments, the crucifixes, together with some *consecrated wafers*, the vulgar Latin Bible, and some other books, and burnt them all! They beat the sides of the chalice together, and having thrown it into the fire, they took it out again, pretending they would sell it, and give it to the poor¹."

DR. LESLIE asserts, that he made particular inquiries into the truth of this horrible sacrilege, as it is not easy to believe that such an insult to our Lord and our God could have been done in a professedly christian country; and he adds, "I have it from *undoubted* hands, and can now give it to the reader for a *certain truth*." All christian churches retain our Lord's own words, and call the elements His Body and Blood, and even the presbyterians themselves "call them by the names of the things they represent; to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ²." Because Christ has not revealed the *manner* of this holy mystery, therefore no church can or ought to define it; but that is the *sin* of the Roman church, which does presume to define what Christ himself chose to leave a mystery. Nevertheless, the sacrament being duly consecrated, is acknowledged by all christians to be the Body of Christ in a mysterious manner: now, to take the symbol of His sacred Body, and to burn it by the hands of the common hangman, is an insult to Christ such as no heathen would have offered to their false gods. To crucify the picture of Our Saviour, to thrust a spear into its side, and to burn it by the hands of the common hangman, is to crucify Christ in effigy, and is as great a contempt of Him as any Jew or Musselman could have shewn³. The common test in Japan for a christian is the trampling on the cross, which none but the Dutch presbyterians will do; yet they were outdone by their brethren in Scotland, who burnt the symbol of their salvation by the hands of the common hangman. The chalice and the priest's vestments were things solemnly dedicated to God's service, and separated to holy uses. But "the profan-

¹ Cassandra, Append. Rehearsals, vi. 261.

² Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. xxix. sec. 5, 7, pp. 164, 165.

³ The bishops that assembled in council at Constantinople, in the year 754, condemned the making pictures or images of Christ; "for, as they argued, He being God as well as man, it was impossible to represent Him by an image; for either the image would represent *only* His manhood, which would not be Christ, but merely a *division* of the two natures which are in Him, or otherwise it must be supposed that the incomprehensible Deity was comprehended by the lines of human flesh: in either case the guilt of blasphemy would be incurred."—*Perceval's Roman Schism*, p. 77.

ing of a chalice, or any thing dedicated to holy uses, is the presbyterian's proper food; they have lived upon it ever since their Reformation; they know no such sin as *sacrilege*, except in taking a rag from their Covenant¹." The hand-writing that appeared on the wall against the king of Babylon was on the instant of his profaning "the golden vessels that were taken out of the temple;" yet he only used them in his festivity at a royal banquet; whereas a presbyterian government burnt them by the hangman, to put the last and greatest possible insult upon the Lord of Life and Glory which it was in their power to effect. Well and justly has it been said, that "sacrilege ran down from the Reformation like a torrent;" and in no part of Christendom has it been carried to such an extent as in Scotland. It need not, therefore, excite "our special wonder," that our name and nation have been taken away, and our candlestick has been removed; that we have been weighed in the balances, and found wanting in that true faith which consists in good works and holy obedience.

A SESSION of parliament commenced on the 6th of July; the marquis of Tweeddale was sent down as high commissioner, the earl of Seafield was lord chancellor, and the earl of Cromarty was principal secretary of state. There was nothing relating to religion in the formal introductory speeches of either of these functionaries, but a slight assurance of her majesty's design to maintain the establishment. The principal topic of all their speeches was an earnest recommendation to settle the succession to the crown in the protestant line of the House of Hanover, which had not yet been done in Scotland. The debates on this subject entirely occupied the attention of parliament, and the state of religion of the two great religious parties in the nation was not touched upon. The parliament was adjourned on the 28th of August². In consequence of the intentional delays of the Scottish parliament in settling the succession, the two Houses in England passed a bill to render all Scotchmen, with certain exceptions, *aliens*, unless the Scottish parliament agreed to the English settlement of the crown in the House of Hanover, or on "Auld Suphy," as the jacobites delighted to call her serene highness.

1605.—As FORMERLY mentioned, the surviving prelates determined to preserve the apostolic succession; but they reserved the government of the church in their own hands, and in the meantime did not commit any diocese to the care of the

¹ Rehearsals, Cassandra, Appendix, vi. 265-268.

² Boyer's Reign of Queen Anne, 130-138—Lockhart's Memoirs, 115-128.

newly-consecrated bishops, which was, unfortunately, a false step, and led to considerable confusion afterwards, that will fall to be mentioned as we proceed. An anonymous writer says—"Length of time and hard circumstances having reduced the number of bishops and clergy, the bishops thought of assuming, by canonical consecration, some of the clergy into their own highest order, and accordingly the archbishop of Glasgow, with the bishops of Edinburgh and Dunblane, did, on the 25th of January, 1705, in the city of Edinburgh, consecrate two very deserving presbyters; viz. Mr. John Sage, who had been one of the ministers of Glasgow before the Revolution, and Mr. John Fullarton, minister also before the Revolution in Paisley. The consecration of these two, and of others to be mentioned presently, *was to preserve the episcopal succession*. They concealed their characters, and performed no episcopal deed, without special advice and authority from the consecrators¹." But the reasons assigned by the consecrators themselves, in the letter of consecration given to bishop Sage, will be, perhaps, satisfactory, and give the real cause which they assigned.

"AT EDINBURGH, the twenty-fifth day of January, in the one thousand seven hundred and fifth year from the Incarnation of Our Lord and Saviour;—We, John, by divine providence archbishop of Glasgow; Alexander, by divine mercy bishop of Edinburgh, and Robert, by divine mercy bishop of Dunblane, in the fear of the Lord; considering that most of our dear brethren and colleagues in the episcopal college, during the long season of affliction which has but lately passed away from our church, have fallen asleep in the Lord, and that the few of us who are by divine mercy left, are almost exhausted by multiplied cares and diseases, and the pressure of old age: Wherefore, from the duty we owe to God, the holy church, and to posterity, we have resolved to entrust the episcopal charge, character, and power, to other good and faithful men, and such as are able to teach and to rule; amongst whom, as from our own knowledge, we are convinced that our reverend brother, John Sage, master of arts, and priest at Glasgow, is suitable and fit for so great an office. We, therefore, trusting to the protection of our divine office according to the grace given to us, in the aforesaid day, month, and year above mentioned, in the private chapel of the lord archbishop of Glas-

¹ Manuscript Memoirs of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, from the memorable Revolution in 1688.

gow, have ordained and consecrated the said John Sage, and chosen him into our episcopal college. In testimony of which we have ordered the seals of John, archbishop of Glasgow, Alexander, bishop of Edinburgh (vicar of the see of St. Andrews, now vacant), to be affixed to this instrument, after its subscription with our own hands.

Sic subscribitur, JO. GLASCUE,
 ALEXANDER EDINBURGEN,
 ROBERT DUNBLANEN,
 (Loc. Sigil. Episcop. Edin.) (Loc. Sigil. Archiepis. Glas.)¹

AT THE SAME time and place, the archbishop of Glasgow, bishops Rose and Douglass, consecrated Mr. John Fullarton, for the same reasons as are mentioned in bishop Sage's Letter of Consecration, to preserve the apostolical succession, and to assist the five prelates with their counsel and concurrence; but they agreed not to exercise jurisdiction over any particular diocese. Thus, says Mr. Skinner, "a plan of episcopacy was introduced into the church, which, it must be owned, was not altogether so conformable to primitive practice as could have been wished, but which the sagacity of these prudent and experienced governors saw expedient for these times, though it cannot be thought they proposed it to be perpetual, as was afterwards pretended, or to take place any longer than it should appear proper and necessary to return to the old models²." At the time of his consecration bishop Sage was domestic chaplain to John Stewart, Esq., of Garntully, in whose family he had resided several years. Bishop Sage's biographer says of him,—“His extraordinary endowments, and especially his exemplary life and conversation, and his consummated wisdom and prudence, made him dear to all the numerous and excellent relations and friends of that great family; and his influence and care reached over all that country; for as he was highly admired and esteemed by all ranks of men, so he was most careful to employ the rare talents God had given him for the benefit and advantage of all³.”

THE QUEEN again permitted the General Assembly to meet on the 29th of March. The marquis of Annandale was sent

¹ Primitive Truth and Order vindicated from Modern Misrepresentation. Appendix, 526, 527.

² List of the consecration and succession of Scots bishops since the Revolution in 1688, under William III., as far as the consecration of bishop Seabury is concerned, p. 75—Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 503—Perceval's Apology for the Doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. 2d edit. Appendix, p. 253.

³ Gillan's Life of the Rev. and learned Mr. John Sage, &c. p. 31. 8vo. 1714, cap. 31.

down commissioner, and the Assembly chose Dr. Carstares, principal of the university of Edinburgh, their moderator. This was an act of gratitude which he well deserved at their hands; for had he not been the man of William's right hand, the presbyterian communion would never have been established. His biographer very justly says, this was "an honour to which he was justly entitled, not only by his services to the church, but by his character, which was excellently suited to command the respect, and moderate the *heats*, of so numerous, and in those days *so turbulent* a judicatory¹." In a letter addressed to him at this time by the lord chancellor Seafield, his lordship says,—“I told my lord Portland you *governed the church*, the university, &c.” This is always the case in republican institutions; men of address and ability aspire to and reach the supreme power, without reference to office; whereas, in a well-regulated hierarchy, it is the office that is respected, and not the talents of the man who is placed as the governor of the church. In the church it is the *office*, which is of God, that is respected, but in the kirk it is the *man*; hence their acknowledged turbulence, contention, intrigue, and partizanship.

THERE is nothing particular to be observed in her majesty's letter, or in the reply, which is merely an echo of it. On the 9th of April the Assembly deposed Mr. John Hepburn, for asserting “that communicating with persons scandalous made those that communicate with them guilty of unworthy communicating—because he neither had dispensed the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper to others, nor partaken thereof himself, *for more than sixteen years!*—because he had intruded into settled kirks—that he had said, the ministers clapped people's heads, and profaned the sacrament by giving it to drunkards, swearers, &c.; and that if they got not *another* religion, they and their religion would *go to the bottomless pit.*” Indeed, there seemed to be some little danger of this last consummation, and it was greatly assisted in its downward journey by the contempt into which the kirk had preached both of their so-called sacraments. Sixteen years was certainly a long time to omit their pretended sacrament, or *Occasion*, as they call it, even although there was no discerning of the Lord's Body, no commemorative sacrifice in it. He was not in the fierce and strong wind that broke asunder the rocks, nor in the earthquake that had overturned His church; but in the still small voice of obedience and charity, in faith believing, proceeding onwards

¹ Life, &c. prefixed to State Papers, p. 74.

to faith obeying His holy will; an obedience which had been practised by the whole church catholic from the beginning. As the kirk now managed these Occasions much sin was committed at them, when great multitudes were collected together; and as they were, they were often depraved to superstitious purposes. An author already cited, says,—These *Occasions* “serve nearly the same ends in our [presbyterian] church that confession and absolution do among the papists; our people put on a very demure look some days before the sacrament; the gloom gradually gathers upon their faces as it approaches, and they look like criminals going to execution when the day is come. Just so may it be seen in the popish countries, in the seasons set apart for confession and penance; but in both countries the professed repentance proves only a flash of devotion, and, as if matters were made up with the Deity, and all former accounts cleared, the papist soon puts off his penitential countenance, and the presbyterian lays by his sacramental face; and they and we, in a little time, are the same men that we were before¹.”

THE ONLY other occurrence worthy of notice was the nomination of a commission for planting the north, nearly all the churches of which were declared to be vacant, although, in fact, they were occupied by the episcopal incumbents. The foundation of the inclinations of the people was a misnomer everywhere out of the province of Glasgow, where the rabble had done execution on the clergy; but in the largest, and at that time the most populous, part of the kingdom, the people were decidedly attached to episcopacy. The commissioner dissolved the Assembly in due course on the 12th of April, and ordered the next meeting to be held on the first Thursday of April next year.

A SESSION of parliament met on the 28th of June; the duke of Argyle sat as lord high commissioner. The principal object of this session was, the two grand political points which then engrossed the public mind of all parties—the settlement of the order of the succession to the crown, and the treaty of Union between the kingdoms. A majority in the house carried a resolution to leave the nomination of the Scottish commissioners to the queen’s appointment; and immediately after this point was settled, an act was passed, empowering commissioners to meet and treat with England. The Scottish parliament restricted the commissioners from treating about

¹ A Blacksmith’s Letter to the Ministers and Elders of the Kirk.

church government, which was supposed to be sufficiently secure in the embraces of the Claim of Right. The parliament was adjourned on the 21st of September¹.

1706.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met in the midst of much public excitement on the 4th of April, and the earl of Glasgow was lord commissioner; but there was no business of any importance before them. By the prudent management of Dr. Carstares the ministers were kept within the bounds of prudence upon the exciting subject of the incorporating union of the two kingdoms. Amongst the people, the Treaty of Union met with almost universal opposition. Lockhart says, the interest of the distressed royal family in exile increased to such a degree, that four parts of five of the nobility and gentry, and above half of the Commons over the whole kingdom, on every occasion expressed their inclination and readiness to assist in their restoration.

BEFORE THE meeting of parliament her majesty's ministers gave such a representation of the treaty, that public opinion began to waver, and to think more favourably of it; but no sooner did the articles appear in print, than they were as universally disliked. The presbyterian ministers conceived fears that the kirk was in danger, and began to preach vehemently against the Union; and several presbyteries and the commission sent addresses against it. Nevertheless, her majesty issued commissions for both kingdoms, appointing the commissioners. Among the English commissioners were the archbishops of Canterbury and York; but the latter would take no share in the negociations, and never was present at any of their meetings. There were no presbyterian ministers among the Scottish commissioners, neither was the kirk represented by any one of her sons.

THE EARL OF LEVEN wrote from London to Dr. Carstares, in the month of June, stating that "there have been several representations from people of quality, particularly from the duke of Athole, to the Secretary of State, complaining of the severities of the presbyterians, in several shires, against the episcopal clergy, both in churches and meeting-houses. Of this the secretaries were obliged to acquaint the queen; but they did it *very favourably*, and told [her majesty] they could give no opinion, having heard only one side, and they were persuaded nothing would be done but *in moderation*, and conform to law, in which her majesty is perfectly satisfied." That is, the persecution was so "*favourably*" represented to her, that she was

¹ Lockhart's Memoirs, 178—Burnet's Own Times, v.—Carstares' State Papers.

made to believe that there was no persecution at all, but that the episcopal clergy were unreasonable and unruly men: this was the way in which her grandfather was imposed on. "Now," continues his lordship, "I must say that it is a great neglect that there is no information given here to any of your friends when any such process is intented, that so we might know whether they are intruders or not; the want of which makes us at a loss how to answer. I believe the earl of Loudon is to write to the advocate, that matters may be managed with moderation at this time; but this I believe you will be as much for as I. But, however, this is no way to hinder *that just prosecution* that may be necessary, both for the vindicating the legal establishment of the church, and the discouragement of the insolency of intruders¹." It appears from this letter, that deception had been practised on the queen, and that she did not know the extent of the persecution that raged in Scotland; and her good intentions in bestowing the bishop's property on the distressed clergy were completely nullified, and her bounty turned into another channel. So here has the national crime of sacrilege been doubly committed; in robbing the prelates of their property in the first instance, and in robbing the whole church of that which the queen had ordered to be restored to it, in the second.

THE PROPOSED UNION excited very violent feelings, especially in that class of society that was under the immediate influence of the presbyterian ministers; the commission of the General Assembly, therefore, sent up a strong remonstrance and address to the queen against it. The articles of the Union were debated, and agreed to by the respective commissioners, on the 2d of July. Three copies were made—one for each of the houses of parliament of each kingdom; but in the treaty, as signed at London, and as it is set down by De Foe, in his history of it, there is not one word on the subject of religion. We learn from Carstares that the remonstrance that was sent up to the queen, by the commission of the Assembly, against any incorporating union of the kingdoms, was from a fear lest the kirk should be polluted *by the spiritual estate* in the imperial parliament. They protested against allowing or giving any manner of consent for the English parliament to take any steps for the security of the church of England, which, they said, would be to homologate episcopacy, and to bring horrible guilt upon them and their posterity. They objected to any other union than to "one in the Lord;" that is, such an union

¹ Carstares' State Papers, 753.

as was consistent with the Covenant obligations of extirpating episcopacy, and establishing presbytery in England. One of Dr. Carstares' correspondents mentions another intemperate address from the commission afterwards, during the sitting of parliament, and he "wishes it were possible to think of some expedient by which the kirk might retrieve her character, and might yet have the honour of being zealous in promoting this Union¹." To gratify the kirk, therefore, her majesty issued a proclamation against the episcopal clergy, and the duke of Queensberry wrote to the privy council, in pursuance of the address of the commission, "*to let the laws loose against the dissenting clergy*," as they insolently called the priests of the holy catholic church. In consequence, the episcopal chapels in Edinburgh, and throughout the kingdom, were shut up, and no public worship was allowed to be celebrated within them, or even in the private dwellings of the clergy. They would not suffer the clergy to preach in the vacant churches, nor allow them to baptize their own children, nor those of their congregations, either in chapels or in private houses². The clergy had now no alternative but to submit, for the law made it *high treason* to speak or to write against presbytery; therefore the danger to life and liberty was too great to venture on any remonstrance or petition against this severe and unjust order.

BEFORE the meeting of parliament, the articles of union that had been agreed on by the national commissioners were published, and the ministers took the alarm that the kirk government was in danger, and "they loudly bellowed against the wicked union, in their pulpits." The parliament met on the 3d of October; the duke of Queensberry was the high commissioner, and the earl of Seafield the chancellor. The proposed union was the principal topic of the queen's letter, and renewed assurances were given of her majesty's resolution to maintain the presbyterian government. Many petitions and remonstrances were presented against the union, and among others, one from the commission of the Assembly, as follows:—"1. That the sacramental Test being the condition of access to places of trust and to benefits from the crown, all of our communion must be debarred from the same, if not in Scotland, yet through the rest of the dominion of Britain; which may prove of the most dangerous consequence to this church. 2. That this church and nation may be exposed to the farther danger of new oaths from the parliament of Great Britain, unless it be provided that no oath, bond, or test of

¹ Carstares' State Papers, 755.

² Cassandra, Appendix, 255.

any kind, shall be required of any minister or member of the church of Scotland, which are inconsistent with the known principles of this church. . . . 3. That the sovereigns of Great Britain be engaged [by oath] to maintain the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of this church, and the rights and privileges of it, as by law are now established. . . . 4. That there be a commission for plantation of kirks, valuation of tiends . . . and a judicatory in Scotland for redressing of grievances and judging causes which were formerly judged by the privy council—such as the growth of popery, *and other irregularities*; and with which judicatory the church might correspond about thanksgivings and fasts. . . . 6. And in the last place, in case this proposed treaty of union shall be concluded, this nation will be subjected in its civil interest to a British parliament, wherein twenty-six prelates are to be constituent members and legislators; and lest our silence should be constructed to import our consent or approbation of the civil places and power of church-men, we crave leave, in all humility and due respect to your grace and honourable estates in parliament, to represent that it is contrary to our known *principles and covenants* that any churchmen should bear civil offices or have power in the commonwealth¹.”—WILLIAM WISHART, Moderator.

THE “IRREGULARITIES” so delicately noticed above, meant the existence of the bishops and clergy of the church, which they had not yet been able to extirpate; but which, with such a commission as this, for which they petitioned, they made no doubt of being able to root out and destroy. The ministers were violent against the union, but the lay elders were in its favour, and thus made a majority in the commission. The ministers, therefore, dwindled away insensibly to their manses in the country, and nothing was done but the presenting the above remonstrance. Lockhart says, “the brethren, for the most part, were guilty of sinful silence, which so enraged the populace against them, that they did not stand to tell them to their faces that they were selfish and time-servers².” The multitude of the addresses from all parts of the kingdom were significant indications of the national aversion to the union; but the parliament paid no attention to them. The insolence of the mob in Edinburgh grew to that height that the commissioner was reviled in the most abusive language when he appeared on the streets, and his guards and

¹ De Foe's History, Appendix, 618, 619.—Lockhart's Memoirs, 241-42.

² Memoirs, 244.

attendants were pelted with stones. On the 12th of November, an act for the security of the establishment passed by a majority of seventy-four votes, and it was engrossed into the article. It statutes and ordains "And her majesty, with advice and consent foresaid, expressly provides and declares that the foresaid true protestant religion, contained in the above-mentioned Confession of Faith, with the form and purity of worship presently in use within this church, and its presbyterian church government and discipline—that is to say, the government of the church by kirk sessions, presbyteries, provincial synods, and General Assemblies, all established by the foresaid acts of parliament, pursuant to the Claim of Right—shall remain and continue unalterable; and that the said presbyterian government shall be the only government of the church within the kingdom of Scotland. That the universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh, as now established by law, shall continue within this kingdom for ever; and that in all time coming, no professors, principals, regents, masters, or others bearing office in any university, college, or school within this kingdom, be capable, or be admitted or allowed to continue in the exercise of their said functions, but such as shall own and acknowledge the civil government in manner prescribed or to be prescribed by the acts of parliament; as also, that before or at their admissions, they do and shall acknowledge and profess, and shall subscribe to, the foresaid Confession of Faith, as the confession of their [own] faith; and that they will practise and conform themselves to the worship presently in use in this church, and submit themselves to the government and discipline thereof; and never endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion of the same; and that before the respective presbyteries of their bounds, by whatsoever gift, presentation, or provision, they may be thereto provided.

"AND FURTHER, her majesty expressly declares and statutes, that none of the subjects of this kingdom shall be liable to, but all and every one of them shall be for ever free of, any oath, test, or subscription within this kingdom, contrary to or inconsistent with the foresaid true protestant religion and presbyterian church government, worship, and discipline, as above established; and that the same, within the bounds of this church and kingdom, shall never be imposed upon or required of them in any sort.

"AND LASTLY, that after the decease of her present majesty, the sovereign succeeding to her in the royal government of the kingdom of Great Britain shall, in all time coming, at

his or her accession to the crown, swear and subscribe that they shall inviolably maintain and preserve the foresaid settlement of the true protestant religion, with the government, worship, discipline, rights and privileges of this church, as above established by the laws of this kingdom, in prosecution of the Claim of Right¹."

THE ACT then provides, that this act of security, with the establishment therein contained, shall be held and observed in all time coming, as a fundamental and essential condition of any treaty of union to be concluded betwixt the two kingdoms, without any alteration thereof or derogation thereto in any sort, for ever. It is hardly possible for language to convey a stronger idea of security than this act presents; yet lord Belhaven and some others thought that it was not a sufficient security for the establishment. There were dangerous riots at Glasgow, Dumfries, and other places, against the union, and the mobs threatened to march to Edinburgh and dissolve the parliament. As soon as the Act of Security was passed, the zeal of the ministers against the union began to slacken, and the commission sent a circular letter to the presbyteries, wherein, "to exoner their consciences, they recommended to all their brethren to discountenance and discourage all irregularities and tumults tending to disturb the government."

1707.—MR. HARLEY, English secretary of state, pressed Dr. Carstares, by letter dated January 7th, to procure a declaration from the commission of Assembly, to shew their approbation of the union in express terms, before the rising of parliament; for, says he, "it must be of a lasting advantage to the church of Scotland to be known to have wished well to the union, and to have promoted it, for that will always procure her the confidence and countenance of all governments that shall understand the true interest of the united state." Dr. Carstares was very serviceable at this time, in *managing* the intractable ministers in the commission, and the queen afterwards thanked him for the great service he had rendered the government². On the 16th of January the Act of Security was touched with the sceptre; so that the establishment of the kirk received a double sanction in this parliament. It was not enacted singly by the union as an effect of the treaty, but it was established by an express law *before* the union, and again repeated in the body of the treaty, as a ratification and recognition of what was before an established law of the

¹Acta Parliamentorum.

² Carstares' State Papers, 757.

of the kingdom. Immediately after this act was passed, the commission of Assembly presented the following remonstrance to parliament; than which nothing shews more intensely their intolerance and bigotry, and their resolution to carry out the obligations of the Covenant:—

“HUMBLY SHEWETH, that we, considering the trust reposed in us by the late General Assembly, find it our duty to lay before your grace and lordships, when, as we are informed, you are about the passing of an act of ratification of the articles of the treaty of union betwixt the two kingdoms of Scotland and England, which contains the following words:— ‘Declaring, nevertheless, that the parliament of England may provide for the security of the church of England as they shall think expedient, to take place within the bounds of the said kingdom, which shall not suspend or derogate from the force and effect of this present ratification, but shall be understood as here included, without any necessity of any new ratification in the parliament of Scotland:’ which clause seems to us not only to be like a blank, put, with your grace and lordships’ consent, in the hands of the parliament of England, to enact what they shall think fit for securing the hierarchy and ceremonies of their church, but also a consent that it be an article and fundamental of the union, and, as it is contained in your ratification, cannot but imply a manifest homologation. We do, therefore, humbly beseech your grace and lordships, that *there be NO SUCH stipulation OR CONSENT for the establishment of that hierarchy and ceremonies [in England] as you would not involve yourselves and this nation in guilt, and as you consult the peace and quiet of this nation, both in church and state.* We pray that God may bless and preserve our gracious queen, and direct your grace and lordships in this and all the great and momentous affairs which are or may be before you¹.”

THIS MONSTROUS piece of intolerance justly gave great offence in England, and Carstares’ correspondents complained of it, and requested him to get up some address to remove the ill impression which this effect of the Covenant had produced. Even De Foe is staggered at it, and cannot defend it; albeit a mortal enemy of the church. The kirk, however, was perfectly consistent, and acted decidedly in conformity with her genuine and avowed principles. So recently as the year of grace, 1829, a consistent body of presbyterians entirely coincides with the above remonstrance, and says:—“Our *national*

¹ De Foe’s Hist. of the Union, 480; and App. 625.

guilt was increased by the terms in which the incorporating union between England and Scotland was settled, and the measures which followed upon it. How desirable soever the union was in itself, and how great soever the *political* advantages which have resulted from it are, yet *the maintenance of the hierarchy and ceremonies in England* being declared a fundamental and essential article of it, the nation of Scotland, by giving its consent to this, *virtually renounced that SACRED league and oath* which it was previously under, *to endeavour the reformation* [EXTIRPATION] *of religion in England*¹." But this intolerant bigotry was not confined to the presbyterians in Scotland, for the same sentiments were entertained by their brethren in England. Upon the confirmation of the act of Uniformity, Calamy remarks:—"The thus confirming the act of Uniformity and the ecclesiastical constitution here in England, in all particulars, upon the present foot, for perpetuity, was reckoned by the dissenters to make their way the clearer, since all hopes of a further reformation of the constitution (of which there is so much need) were hereby taken away. The old puritans, many of them, fell in with the established church, in hope of that way contributing to a further reformation; and they that adhere to their principles have, since the restoration, been often pressed to imitate their example, and fall in with the established church, with that view; and some worthy persons have actually done it."

THE ACT of the parliament of England for the security of their own church is very similar to the Scottish act, and provides that the act of Uniformity and some others shall remain and be in force for ever. The acts establishing the respective churches of the two kingdoms were no parts of the treaty, but the distinct act and deed of the parliament of each kingdom; and if the Scots kirk thought they sinned in homologating episcopacy in England, the church of England was equally guilty in recognising and establishing presbytery in Scotland; with this material distinction, that what was done in Scotland was an act of the state only, whereas in England both church and state united in "homologating" presbytery. But, in truth, neither party had any other concern in the case than to secure that which belonged to themselves; and which each party was fully entitled to do. The ratification of the Treaty of Union passed in the Scottish parliament on the 16th of January, and on the 18th the duke of Queensberry despatched it to London by an express. Several gentlemen,

¹ Testimony of Orig. Seceders, 40.

anticipating some honourable marks of distinction, contended for the honour of being the bearer of it to the queen ; but, to avoid giving offence to the disappointed fiery claimants, the commissioner sent it up by a private express. The queen immediately caused it to be laid before both Houses of Parliament at the same time ; and it was read in the Commons on the 22d of January, and, as the best way to go through the whole, they ordered every article to be read and voted upon singly, in a committee of the whole House. “ It may, perhaps, surprise posterity,” says De Foe, “ when the debates, disputes, heats, and long speeches which these articles occasioned in Scotland come to be read, and they shall come to understand that, in the House of Commons in England, every article passed one by one, after the sedatest reading, calmest considering, and leisurely proceeding, without any opposition, amendment, or alteration—no, not in the least. There was some small opposition against it in general, in the House of Lords, but no amendment offered to any particular article, nor any thing considerable objected¹.” In that house, a lay peer moved, that as the Scottish parliament had given a character of the kirk, by extolling its worship and government, their lordships should not be behind hand in giving a character of the best constituted church in the world. Bishop Bull immediately rose, and said, “ My lords, I second what that noble lord has moved, and do think it highly reasonable, that in this bill a character should be given of our most excellent church ; for, my lords, whoever is skilled in primitive antiquity, must allow it for a certain and evident truth that the church of England is, in her doctrine, discipline, and worship, most agreeable to primitive and apostolical institution².” Several peers offered the following rider to the treaty, which was read a first time, but the second reading was negatived:—“ Provided always, that nothing in this ratification contained shall be construed to extend to an *approbation* or an acknowledgment of the truth of the presbyterian way of worship, or allowing the religion of the [established] church of Scotland to be what it is styled—‘ the true protestant religion³.’” The original treaty was ordered to be lodged in the Tower of London, amongst the registers and rolls of parliament, *in perpetuam rei memoriam*.

ON THE 19th of March the exemplification of the act of

¹ De Foe's History of the Union, 484, 485.

² Nelson's Life of Bp. Bull, cited in Episcopal Magazine, li. 490.

³ De Foe's History, Appendix, 682.

parliament of England, ratifying the treaty of Union betwixt Scotland and England, under the great seal of England, was read in the Scottish parliament, and ordered to be recorded. The act for securing the protestant religion and presbyterian church government was ordered to be proclaimed and printed. It was an object of general surprise, and, to the opponents of the Union, of considerable disappointment, that the treaty had been so readily and so summarily passed in the English parliament, without the least deviation, alteration, or amendment whatever. The only addition made to it was the insertion of the act of Security for the church of England, corresponding to the same insertion in Scotland. His grace the commissioner thanked the House for their important public services, and for their particular kindness to himself; and then adjourned the House till the 22d of April. On that day it again met, when the act of Union was touched with sceptre, with the usual formalities, and the House again adjourned till the 28th; when it again met, AND WAS DISSOLVED FOR EVER¹.

OUT OF THE EVILS which our own sins, and their consequent punishments, bring upon us, God, in His merciful goodness, often realizes blessings and benefits where we least expect or deserve them. The Scottish patriots of that day saw nothing but unmitigated evil in the Union; but we, who live a century and a half later, have reason to be thankful for the blessings which that event has produced. Yet, perhaps I may be singular, but I cannot help thinking that the Union was a *punishment* to Scotland for her national sins. Ever since the Norman Conquest it has been the policy of every monarch who has swayed the English sceptre to endeavour to annex Scotland to the crown of England, either by marriage, by conquest, or by union. The basis for the first mode was laid in the marriage of Saint Margaret, of blessed memory, with Malcolm Canmore. Margaret was the sister of Edgar Atheling, who was the true heir to the English throne in the Saxon line, and her descendant, James VI., restored that line to England, after an interval of upwards of five hundred years. Henry I. of England married Matilda, St. Margaret's daughter, and several intermarriages took place. The marriage, however, that was the more immediate forerunner of the union, was that of James IV. with the princess Margaret, eldest daughter of Henry VII., in the year 1504. This princess became a widow in 1513, and next year married Archibald Douglas, earl of Angus, by whom she had a daughter named Margaret, who married

¹ De Foe's History of the Union, p. 527.

Matthew Stewart, earl of Lennox, whose son, Henry Stewart, lord Darnley, married her descendant by her first marriage, Mary queen of Scots. As Henry VIII.'s family became extinct, the descendant of his sister Margaret, queen of James IV., by her second marriage, James VI. was the heir of the English throne after Elizabeth's death. He was the son of Henry lord Darnley and his cousin queen Mary, and united the pretensions of both his father and his mother to the throne of England; and his accession paved the way to that peaceable union which was accomplished by his great grand-daughter Anne.

THE CONQUEST of Scotland had often been attempted; but never was accomplished, till the demon of religious discord and fanaticism laid the kingdom prostrate at the feet of Oliver Cromwell. In her wars with France, England's strength was greatly weakened by having a powerful enemy in her rear, ever ready to attack her when engaged with her continental enemies. The removal of this troublesome neighbour was worth almost any price, and it is evident the English commissioners made considerable sacrifices of national advantages to what may not unfitly be denominated the weaker vessel. Instead of a dangerous enemy, the Union made Scotland an integral part of her territory, and her firmest friend, and she has ever since stood shoulder to shoulder with her in all her glorious achievements by sea and land. Long cherished enmities, emulations, and desolating wars, have ceased for ever; and the native valour of each country is now combined in carrying the scourge of war far from the shores of the united kingdom. Since that important epoch all things have become new; instead of the ancient distinctions of name and race, the old names have been sunk in the new style of GREAT BRITAIN—the British crown—the British parliament—the British empire—the British sovereign, and British interests.

AMONGST the first projects that James VI. entertained after his accession to "the promised land," as he called it, was the proposal of an incorporating union; but the pear was not then ripe. Charles I. had no time to think on such a subject; but Oliver Cromwell not only thought of it, but in some degree accomplished it, by having an united parliament for the two kingdoms. Charles II. more than once proposed an union; but the people on both banks of the Tweed looked upon the scheme as chimerical, and the parliaments of neither country would enter heartily into it. An achievement of a different nature stimulated the ambition of James VII. An union of slavery to the dominion of the bishop of Rome was the solitary occupant of his gloomy thoughts; and it was necessary

rather to divide than to unite the kingdoms for the accomplishment of this mad project. He met, however, with the most powerful and determined resistance from the weakest and most unexpected quarter,—the bishops and the clergy of both kingdoms. From the first moment of William's settlement on his father-in-law's throne, he proposed, and never ceased to recommend and to urge, an union of the kingdoms; and he repeatedly said that the crown of England would never possess military strength and resources till that event should mingle the national troops under one standard in the field. Queen Anne set in real earnest to accomplish this difficult task; and declared that she would consider its accomplishment the greatest glory of her reign. In her speech to her English parliament she said, "I hope it will be a lasting blessing to the whole island, a great addition to its wealth and power, and a firm security to the protestant religion."

IN THE FIRST two points her majesty's hopes have been completely realized; but the passing of the "Roman Catholic Relief Bill" has removed that security to religion which her majesty hoped would be permanent. The jesuits of the present day are wiser in their generation than those of the time of James VII. They find that they can accomplish their objects better by affecting *liberality*, than by practising bigotry. *Liberal* acts of parliament, that level "the walls of Jericho;" that remove the church's fences and landmarks; that admit papists to places and power, and to *legislate* for the reformed catholic church of the united empire, as well as for the protestant kirk of Scotland; that abolish ten bishopricks "at one fell swoop," besides others in England, will answer the purposes of the jesuits *much better* than dispensing with the laws did, during their former supremacy in the government in Father Petre's time.

I HAVE SAID it may be considered as a punishment to North Britain; and when the long course of national sins of a religious nature that have been displayed in this history, not to speak of those of a political character, which have been foreign to this work, is considered, it can hardly, I think, be disputed. The Jews were afraid that the Romans would come and take away their name and nation; but has not our name and nation been taken away; the seat of government removed from its capital; its ancient parliament diminished, and merged into the *British* parliament; its peers made elective; its church no longer an estate of the realm, not even its kirk represented in parliament; its name sunk in that of England or of Britain, and the whole external relations of the government

known only by the name of the cabinet of England? But when the manifold national sins and provocations are considered, by which, as a nation, we have provoked the Lord to anger, we can only lay our hand on our mouths, and our mouths in the dust, and turn to Him with thanksgivings and praise for remembering mercy in the midst of judgment.

WE PROVOKED the Lord before what is called the Reformation, by all the sins that the Roman church is heir to, especially in vitiating the apostolic succession by lay-admixtures; and after that event by the most enormous sacrilege as a *national* act. We robbed God of every species of property that the genuine piety and the spurious superstition of our ancestors had bestowed on Him for His worship; and we cast down His temples; destroyed His altars; removed not only the daily sacrifice of prayer and praise, but we rendered the land desolate by extirpating His priesthood, and so interdicting the sacraments generally necessary to salvation. Our so-called reformers produced unparalleled immorality in private life; the sin that brought on the deluge; that sank the cities of the plain in fire and brimstone; that caused the death, by the visitation of God, of three-and-twenty thousand Israelites in one day, in the matter of Baal Peor, was more common, and more gloried in, by both sexes of all ranks, than the holy estate of matrimony. We provoked God by the most horrible guilt of blood, with which the whole kingdom was fearfully polluted. Blood was poured on the earth as water. Revenge for real or imaginary causes descended from generation to generation as an hereditament, to be wiped out only in the blood of the victim, which, in its turn, entailed a new hereditary and bloody obligation upon the heirs of the sufferer. How could the love of God dwell in the hearts of men cherishing such sins and bloody reprisals?

OUR REFORMERS taught that for gospel against which St. Paul denounces damnation, namely, rebellion and sedition:—"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are of God. Whosoever, *therefore*, resisteth the power [the sovereign] resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." The practice of our reformers was consistent with their principles; for they excited the people to sedition and rebellion during the whole course of the reigns of Mary and of James. Sacrilege and covetous desires prompted the nobility and feudal chiefs to unite their interests with the presbyterian disciples of Knox and Melville, and the united faction incurred the apostolic

anathema by their open rebellion in Charles I.'s reign, which swept like a tornado over the three kingdoms. Jesuits, those ministers of hell, secretly prompted presbyterian malignity, and aristocratic sacrilege and revenge. The consequence was the utter extirpation of the church of Scotland, and the prostration of the churches of England and Ireland; all the bloodshed of the rebellion; the betrayal and sale of the king's person; the total destruction and subversion of God's ordinance, the kingly power; and the murder of the king himself. Hypocrisy is denounced in holy writ as a sin most detestable to God; and our Lord denounced eight distinct woes against that sin in the person of the Pharisees just before His passion. During the grand rebellion, both Neal and Baillie complain of the prevalence of the sin of hypocrisy as being most peculiarly obnoxious in the whole body of the people. After the Restoration, the sin of hypocrisy, combined with sedition and open rebellion, was equally prevalent as during the reign of cant and Cromwell; indeed, the covenant made rebellion and presbyterianism convertible terms. In short, the measure of our national guilt was filled up by the apostacy of so many of our nobles and gentry to the idolatry and will-worship of popery just preceding the Revolution; with the unparelled persecution of the church of God at and after that event, when God permitted the unruly wills of men to exercise their full sway, like the wild boar to root out and extirpate the very name of religion from the country. The dioceses of Glasgow and Galloway, where this worse than pagan persecution began, and where the holy place, the sanctuary, was first trodden under foot, were left almost desolate of even that "supply of sermon" that the few presbyterian preachers could give. The people, therefore, were literally left as sheep without shepherds, the Great Shepherd and Bishop of Souls having been driven from their coasts in the persons of His ambassadors. The persecution continued for nearly a century after the Revolution; and it is homologated at this hour by the approbation of those without the church who are partakers in the evil deeds of our forefathers, by bidding them "*God speed*," and by approving of their worst and most reprobate actions.

BUT MAN'S extremity is God's opportunity. In the midst of this dreadful persecution, when to the eye of man there was scarcely a remnant of the church left, yet His all-seeing eye beheld more than 7,000 honest knees that had not bent to presbytery, and faithful hearts that had not worshipped the image that had been set up in the kingdom. The pressure of persecution rendered this faithful remnant more obedient to the

authority of the church, and more steady in their adherence to the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, to the communion of saints, and to the authorised prayers of the church catholic. The union of the kingdoms of England and Scotland, and the subsequent union of these with Ireland, has had the effect of uniting into one, what were before three distinct national churches. Though there was an union of the two kingdoms, yet there was no union, but rather a greater repulsion than ever, betwixt the church of England and the Scottish establishment. Each party was afraid of the other, made separate terms for themselves, and used every legitimate fence one against the other. Between these there could be no more union than between God and Belial; because they are fundamentally opposed to each other both in name and nature. One of them is bound by covenant to extirpate the other, root and branch; and has done so before, and is prepared to do so again as soon as a favourable opportunity offers.

THE ACT OF SECURITY, which is embodied in the Treaty of Union, gave the kirk a permanence and security which it had never before possessed; and for ever dashed the cup of hope from the lips of those confessors who had dreamt, when the fire of the Lord had passed through and purified the land, that the church would again recover her establishment. An ecclesiastical union, however, now took place, without any regard to legal establishments, such as was among christian churches before there were christian kings or establishments. In the primitive ages, national churches were independent of each other as far as regarded authority and jurisdiction; only they kept communion and fellowship one with another. Even when the governments of the world were heathen, the church distributed her districts and dioceses according to the natural order and distribution of the civil divisions; as, for instance, in the Saxon Heptarchy. This method contributed towards an easier and better commerce and communication with each other. When nations or provinces united and became one nation, the churches in their territories that had been before independent national churches, then became one united national church, as the present church of England is composed of the united independent provincial churches of the different states of the Heptarchy and of Wales. The sister churches of the Heptarchy became united into the one national church of England. The sister churches of England and Scotland, at the union of their respective kingdoms, and the independent sister church of Ireland, at the union of that kingdom with Great Britain, ceased to be any longer sister churches, but

were incorporated into one episcopal church. In the same degree, therefore, that Great Britain and Ireland make but one kingdom, so do the three national episcopal churches make but one apostolical church.

THE ESTABLISHMENT of the church in any kingdom is an accidental circumstance, which was bestowed by the piety of the first christian kings. The impiety of other kings, or of men acquiring supreme power, may deprive the church of her establishment, but it deprives her of no intrinsic power nor divine gift, of which she is possessed. This has happened in Scotland. The church there was deprived by *lay power* of her establishment, under which she had suffered not a small degree of persecution, and laboured under the disadvantage at least, if not *the sin*, of extemporary worship. Although she was cut off from being established, yet she neither was, nor could be, cut off from being part of the episcopal church of Great Britain, for there is but one episcopate throughout the whole earth, of which each bishop holds a share. Therefore the bishops of Scotland are BRITISH BISHOPS, and make a part of the EPISCOPAL COLLEGE of Great Britain and Ireland; only they are prevented by state deprivation from exercising the same legal jurisdiction that the bishops of the united church of England and Ireland are entitled to. This, however, being accidental to the church, neither alters her essence nor affects her divine charter from Christ; and it may be restored to her again when the veil is taken off the heart of Moses.

CHAPTER LX.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RIGHT REV. ALEXANDER ROSE, D.D.
VICAR-GENERAL OF THE PROVINCE OF ST. ANDREWS.

1707.—Declension of the kirk.—An Assembly.—Restrictions on the press.—Prayer-book—legal formula.—General thanksgiving for the Union in England, and a fast in Scotland.—Death of the bishop of Moray.—1708.—Chapels shut up.—French invasion.—Persecutions.—Clergy summoned to take the oaths—their chapels shut up.—The Liturgy.—Assembly.—Death of Prince George, and of archbishop Paterson.—1709.—Mr. Greenshields—officiates by the Liturgy—routed out—hires another house—threatened with rabbling and prosecution—benches and desks broken—summoned before the presbytery—protested—is condemned—he declined their jurisdiction—received a threatening letter—imprisoned.—Consecrations of bishops Falconar and Christie—deed—the consecrators.—General Assembly—act against the Liturgy.—Mr. Greenshields' bill of suspension—his letter to a friend—his petition to the Court of Session—his pleading.—Parallel case of the presbyterian ministers.—The spiritual authority of the bishops not affected by the Act of Deprivation.—Principles advanced by the Court of Session.—Instances of the use of the Liturgy.—Shews the injustice of his imprisonment—appeals to the queen and parliament.—The fears of the presbyterians.—Extensive use of the Liturgy.—Case of Mr. Skinner.—Dr. Sacheverel.—1710.—The doctor impeached—his trial.—The mob destroy the presbyterian meeting-houses in London.—His speech at the bar—condemned—sentence—his sermons burnt by the hangman.—Public opinion.—His reception at Oxford, &c.—Bishop Rose's letter.

1707.—“FROM THIS TIME forward the [presbyterian] church of Scotland presents the melancholy aspect of a *declining and unfaithful* church; assailed by enemies without, and corrupted and betrayed by worse and more deadly foes within her own communion¹.” This is a melancholy admission by one of her own sons, that the untempered mortar with which the kirk had been built could not prevent those corruptions, and that unfaithfulness that has ever followed all advents to her esta-

¹ Hetherington's History, 192.

blishment. Lockhart tells us, that many additional clauses were offered to be inserted in the Act of Security, for the support of the kirk, but they were rejected by the earl of Marchmont and others, lest the church of England should think that the kirk had got better terms than her. This act accordingly did not satisfy “men of more mettle and understanding than the well-meaning brethren; so that still the bulk of the ministry were piqued, though they bore it quietly, and made not so much noise as at the beginning¹.” Immediately after the union the treasurer of England managed the collection of the Customs and Excise in Scotland, “as if the design had been to contrive methods to exasperate the spirits of the people there. . . . And all these things heightened the prejudices with which that nation had been possessed against the union².”

IN THE MIDST of this exasperation of spirit, unfaithfulness, and declining state, the General Assembly met on the 8th of April, with the earl of Glasgow as commissioner, and John Stirling as moderator. Neither the queen’s letter nor the assembly’s answer are recorded in the printed acts; but Hetherington says, there is the following sentence in her letter:—“We take this opportunity of renewing to you our assurance, that you shall have our protection in the free enjoyment of all the rights and privileges that by law you are possessed of.” Popery and presbytery have always shewn themselves afraid of a free press, and an instance of this apprehension occurs in this Assembly; for an act was made, ordering presbyterians “to take special notice of any book or pamphlet that shall be framed or contrived, printed or published, by any minister of this church, and examine if there be anything therein contrary to the doctrine, worship, discipline, or government, or prejudicial to the rights, privileges, or unity of this church, and that they censure such as shall transgress herein³.”

THE BOOK of Common Prayer was also an object not only of their aversion for the sound catholic doctrines it contains, but of apprehension lest they should prevail, and the people give a preference to the sober decencies of liturgic worship. They accordingly framed an “act against *innovations* in the worship of God.” They express their thankfulness for the purity of divine worship which they enjoyed, and say, “being well informed . . . that *innovations*, particularly in the worship of God, *are of late set up* in some places in

¹ Memoirs, 257, 8.

² Burnet’s Own Times, v. 333, 334.

³ Acts of Assembly, session v. p. 401.

public assemblies . . . and that endeavours are used to promote the same by persons of known disaffection to the present establishment, the introduction whereof was not so much as once attempted, even during the late prelacy; and considering also that *such* innovations are *dangerous* to this church, and manifestly contrary to our known principle (which is, that nothing is to be admitted in the worship of God but what is *prescribed* in the Holy Scriptures) . . . that they tend to the fomenting of schism and division, to the disturbance of the peace and quiet both of church and state. Therefore . . . doth hereby discharge the practice of all such innovations in divine worship *within this church* . . . and do instruct and enjoin the commission of this Assembly to use all proper means, by applying to the government or otherwise, for suppressing *all such innovations*, and preventing the evils and dangers that may ensue thereupon to this church¹." The "innovations" did not take place *within* their communion, but their comprehensive supremacy made them legislate for the church although it did not acknowledge their jurisdiction, nor paid any attention to their fulminations.

THIS ASSEMBLY drew up, and passed, "A Form of Process in the judicatories of the church of Scotland, with relation to scandals and censures," consisting of nine chapters: it regulates the commencement of processes, the mode of appealing from one court to a superior, the processes against ministers, the order of excommunication, and, above all, a regulation for the discovering and tracing, through all its contaminating details, the besetting sin of presbytery. This act prescribes the chief formula for the direction of the various ecclesiastical judicatories, in all matters that come before them. After voting an address to the queen the commissioner dissolved the Assembly, and appointed the next meeting to be holden on the third Thursday of April next year. M'Cormick says—"The union of the kingdoms, though attended with other happy consequences, gave a *fatal blow* to the importance of the church of Scotland in the eye of government, and the General Assembly was no longer so *formidable* to administration as it had been from the Revolution down to this period²." The queen appointed a general thanksgiving to be observed throughout the realm of England on the 1st day of May, that being the day on which the Union took place; and on that day the queen herself went in "great state" to St. Paul's, when the bishop of Oxford preached before her majesty. But the irritation in

¹ Sess. Ult, p. 418.

² Life of Carstares, p. 78.

Scotland was so great, that the queen was contented to express merely a desire that a thanksgiving might be kept through the whole island, but left it entirely to her servants there to consider the reasonableness of it. The General Assembly, however, made no overture to the government, and it was not thought prudent to propose it. Instead, however, of a thanksgiving, the commission of the kirk ordered a fast to be observed, and the earl of Glasgow wrote to thank Dr. Carstares for having managed matters so well¹.

THE LORD BISHOP of Moray, Dr. William Hay, of the family of Park, retired to the house of his son-in-law, on the Castlehill at Inverness, when he was driven from his palace at Elgin. That town was within his own diocese, and it is probable he continued to administer its affairs to those who still adhered to the church. He died there on the 17th of March, in his 60th year, having been born on the 17th of February, 1647.

1708.—GOVERNMENT had intelligence that a secret expedition, of considerable magnitude, was preparing at Dunkirk, and no doubt was entertained that Scotland was the object of it. Just previous to the sitting down of the last parliament, orders came down from court to shut up all the episcopal chapels, in order to remove any feeling of jealousy that the presbyterians might entertain during the debates on the treaty of Union. This rumoured invasion occasioned the episcopalians fresh trouble, for they were immediately supposed to be deeply implicated in the plot. The French at last made no secret that the forces concentrated at Dunkirk were intended for Scotland, to reinstate the son of the late king on the throne of his ancestors. They alleged that this expedition was undertaken at the request of many of his subjects in that kingdom; and the government very charitably ascribed this solicitation to the episcopalians alone. Some of the nobility and episcopal gentlemen were accordingly arrested. The French fleet sailed from Dunkirk, and appeared off Montrose on the 12th of March, where they held some communication with the shore, and then stood away for the Firth of Forth. Sir George Byng immediately pursued them, and saw them lying at anchor under the isle of May on the 14th, when they weighed, and made the best of their way home, without having landed any of the troops or artillery on board, or having had a communication with any of the friends of the exiled family on shore. Scotland was at this time entirely defenceless, and had the French landed, with all their stores and am-

¹ Carstares' State Papers, 761-763.

² Keith's Catalogue, 155.

munition, they would have met with very little opposition, and might very soon have been masters of the country¹.

BUT IT WAS NOT TO BE; the incapacity of the French admiral was the immediate cause of defeating an expedition that had every appearance of success attending it. The sceptre had for ever departed from the House of Stuart, and the exiled prince did not appear to possess the abilities requisite for its recovery. The episcopal clergy were the chief sufferers by this ridiculous expedition, "as it was alleged to be a plot of them and their party to bring over the son of the late king James, who was now styled the Pretender, to whose interest they were believed to be devoted, because they had hitherto refused the oaths to his sister²." The presbyterian tyranny, that had been for some time suppressed, broke out at this time with fresh fury; "when they listed such as kept meeting-houses, and others whom they called intruders into churches (though some of them were orderly possessed of them before presbyteries were settled in the bounds), in the same infamous roll with the most scandalous malefactors, and prosecuted them before the commissioners of justiciary, where they were not allowed the benefit of the queen's indemnity, just then published, though it was granted to the malefactors listed with them. Mr. Guthrie, one of the pannels, for preaching in his manse at Fetteresso [in the county of Kincardine, and the diocese of St. Andrews], after he had been turned out of the church, was banished the shire, though the jury brought him in *Not Guilty*; and some time after, Mr. Hay, at Aberlossor, was banished the kingdom, *for baptizing a child*!³" The commission of the kirk happened to be sitting at this time, and they ordered a fast to be observed on the first Thursday of April, to which government afterwards gave its sanction. The suspected persons who had been arrested, were sent up to London, and their innocence appearing decidedly, they were all dismissed, except a few, against whom there appeared some evidence. Mr. Lockhart seizes on this incident to exclaim indignantly, "to what a fine market Scotland had brought her hogs—her nobility and gentry being led in chains from one end of the island to the other, merely on account of suspicion, and without any accusation or proof against them⁴."

WHEN HER MAJESTY gave her Scottish privy council notice of the intended invasion, she recommended them to take all

¹ De Foe's History of the Union; Preface, 2-9.

² Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 605.

³ A Representation of the State of the Church in North Britain, p. 18.

⁴ Memoirs, 383.

proper precautions against the danger. Their first step, therefore, was to suppress all the episcopal chapels and places of prayer-meeting, unless the clergy immediately qualified themselves by taking the oaths to the queen. Orders were issued out to all the inferior magistrates to put their resolution in execution. The clergy were immediately summoned by the magistrates of the city, and interrogated whether or not they prayed for her majesty by name, and if they had qualified themselves by taking the oath of allegiance, and subscribing the same with the Assurance? The clergy objected to this summary mode of proceeding, that they had not been legally cited, and objected against any sentence that might be pronounced against them. To this it was answered, that the clergymen "having been convened for notour disaffection by not praying and by not taking the oath of allegiance, not keeping fasts and thanksgivings, the citations were good and the procedure unquestionable—all which were notour, and being *negatives, proved themselves!*—The magistrates decided that as they had neither prayed nor sworn according to law every one of them must desist from keeping of meeting-houses within the city of Edinburgh and liberties thereof, and from preaching or exercising any part of the ministerial function within the same in time coming, under the pain of imprisonment, to find caution [security] for that effect . . . and in the meantime that their meeting-houses be shut up¹." No less than *seventeen* clergymen were thus silenced, who officiated within the city and suburbs of the capital; five of whom were committed to the common gaol². The queen is represented as having been a faithful and zealous daughter of the holy church; but upon this occasion her evil advisers recommended her to thank the persecuting magistrates of Edinburgh for their zeal in her service, and to approve of their conduct "as acceptable service; and further, to judge it necessary for the safety of her royal person and government, that *all such meeting-houses in every other place* should be shut up³."

As soon as the danger of invasion was over, the government "thrust the clergy out privily," as the Roman governor attempted to send the apostles Paul and Silas out of prison at Philippi. De Foe says, "the ministers who had been confined were *silently* let go." Under this persecution, and "all this load of popular clamour and legal severity, there was still the face of a church kept up, and, amidst the many restraints and distresses which they struggled with, the clergy were so

¹ De Foe's Preface. 17.

² Ibid. 18.

³ Ibid. 19.

diligent, and by their diligence so successful in their labours. that in many places they got their people prevailed on to admit the exercise of liturgical worship in their religious assemblies, as more decent, more intelligible, and better calculated for public devotion, than the presbyterian method which they had been accustomed *to hear*, but could *not* be said *to join in*. The use of the English Book began now to spread through various corners of the kingdom. It had been approved of by many of the clergy long ago, and some of them had even used it openly in the kirks¹." The preceding year, the English liturgy was introduced into the chapels of St. Andrews, Aberdeen, and in many places in the counties of Forfar and Moray, where the great majority of the inhabitants were attached to the reformed catholic church. This, says Mr. Skinner, "was not only a great improvement in itself, but likewise a wonderful change from the cross humours of former times; and is a clear demonstration how much more easily and peaceably people will be reconciled to decency of practice in religious concerns, by the winning arguments of persuasive instruction, than by the peremptory compulsion of authority, however regular and competent²."

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY again met on the 15th of April; the earl of Glasgow was sent down as commissioner, and Dr. Carstares was chosen moderator. In her letter, the queen thanks them for their loyalty on the late attempted invasion, and assures them of her firm resolution to maintain their government and discipline as by law established, and to protect them in the free enjoyment of all their rights and privileges. In their reply, they express their persuasion that her majesty will discourage the opposition made to them by some, who are not more disaffected to the establishment than to her majesty's person and government. The commissioner dissolved the Assembly on the 27th of April, and appointed the next to meet on the second Thursday of April, next year³.

THE QUEEN issued a proclamation on September the 20th, against unlawful intruders into churches and manses in Scotland; and another for putting the laws in execution against popery. His royal highness prince George of Denmark, the queen's husband, died on October the 28th, at Kensington, of an asthma, in the fifty-fifth year of his age, having been born at Copenhagen in April, 1653. He was married to the queen in July, 1683, and was an illustrious instance of con-

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical Hist. ii. 605-6.

² Ibid. 607.

³ Acts of Assembly, 420-422-430.

jugal affection among the great. His body was interred in Westminster Abbey, with all the pomp consistent with a private funeral¹. On December the 9th, Dr. John Paterson, lord archbishop of Glasgow, died in his own house in Edinburgh, in the seventy-sixth year of his age and the thirty-second of his episcopate. By his grace's death, the strength of the Scottish episcopate was reduced to five persons—three anti-revolution and two post-revolution bishops².

1709.—AMONGST those who were condemned to bonds and imprisonment, there was one of firmer nerves and more intrepid character than most of his brethren, and who may be called the first who suffered for openly and fearlessly using the liturgy in a public chapel. The rev. James Greenshields, a native of Scotland, was ordained deacon and priest by Dr. Ramsay, lord bishop of Ross, after his deprivation in the year 1694, and about two years before his lordship's death. Soon after his ordination he went to Ireland, and was immediately appointed to the curacy of Tynan, in the diocese of Armagh, where he served with respect till January, a period of thirteen years. He then formed a resolution to visit his native country and friends, and for that purpose obtained the primate's license and his own rector's permission. He had likewise the precaution to bring testimonials with him of his loyalty to her majesty, and conformity to the established government both in church and state, and of an unsullied and excellent private character. These he received in the most ample form, from the archbishop of Armagh, the archdeacon and the vicar-general of the diocese, from his own rector, and from a great many of the neighbouring clergy and gentry. Soon after his arrival in Edinburgh, he was informed by the new incumbent of his late rector's death, and that he intended to serve the cure himself. Finding himself without a curacy, or the means of living, he determined to open a place of worship, in which he intended to read the full service of the church of England, as he had been accustomed to do in Ireland, and to collect a congregation favourable to that manner of worship. This he justly thought "would tend to the promoting of piety and religion, and afford a place for those to resort to for public worship who did not attend the worship of the presbyterian church, nor keep communion with it; of which number there were several persons and families of English, who, since the Union, have settled here on account of their employments in her majesty's service³."

¹ Salmon's Chronological Hist. i. 358.

² Keith's Catalogue, 270.

³ A True State of the Case of the Rev. Mr. Greenshields, now prisoner in the

AT THIS TIME he had a wife and seven children to provide for. At first he hired a private chamber in the Canongate, where he officiated for a few Sundays to some gentlemen and their families, till the magistrates of that part of the city routed him out. He then found a more convenient house in the High-street, nearly opposite the Cross. He and some friends informed the owner for what purpose it was to be employed, and agreed with him for the removal of the partitions. It was then prepared for public worship, and a numerous congregation assembled in it weekly. The presbytery of Edinburgh applied to the provost and magistrates to stop this meeting, and to shut up the door, on account of the "innovations in worship" which were practised in it. Mr. Greenshields was informed that he should not be disturbed if he would discontinue the public use of the English liturgy, even although he might not be qualified according to law. Many of the presbyterian preachers themselves were not so qualified, for they never prayed for the princess Sophia and the protestant succession. Mr. Greenshields was armed *cap à pie* with qualifications; and as he could not be got at on that point, a person was therefore sent to discover whether or not any thing in his sermons might be laid hold of; but there also he was impervious. He was next threatened with *rabbling*; and he was advised to desist, lest a mob might treat him in the same barbarous manner that so many of his brethren had been used. But he resolved to continue to officiate as formerly, "relying on the justice of the government for protection as a free subject; because, though presbytery was established, yet *there was no law against* episcopal meetings, or making use of the liturgy of the church of England in them¹."

MR. GREENSHIELDS communicated his resolution to the lord provost, and begged his protection; his lordship replied that he had no intention of giving him any trouble, but he feared he might meet with it from others. His landlord was next induced by his persecutors to represent by petition to the dean of guild that he only let his house to Mr. Greenshields

Tolbooth [gaol] in Edinburgh, for reading Common Prayer in an Episcopal Congregation there; though qualified by taking the Oaths and praying for the Queen and Princess Sophia. With Copies of several original Papers relating to his Accusation, Defence, Imprisonment, and Appeal, first to the Lords of Session in North Britain, and since in the House of Lords. Printed for Jonah Bowyer, at the Rose in Ludgate-street, near the West End of St. Paul's Church. 1710.

¹ True Case, &c. p. 6.

as a dwelling-house, that it had been altered, and put to another purpose, contrary to agreement, and that by collecting crowds of people in it, the house was in danger of falling. Contrary to legal usage, Mr. Greenshields was neither permitted to see this petition nor allowed an opportunity of answering it; but the dean of guild immediately granted a warrant to break open the door, and to demolish all the desks and benches, which had been erected at Mr. Greenshields' private cost. Mr. Greenshields petitioned the magistrates, shewing the falsehood of his landlord's allegations, and offered to prove by evidence, not only that the house was let for the purpose of a church meeting, but that the landlord himself gave the carpenter directions to take down the partitions, and how to dispose of them. He prayed to be restored to the possession of his house till the case should be examined; it being, he said, contrary to the very nature of justice to condemn a person without hearing him; but all to no purpose; he was still put off without any hope of redress. Mr. Greenshields hired another house and officiated in it. He was then summoned by the presbytery to appear at their bar "*to give an account of himself.*" Although this court had no jurisdiction over him, yet he appeared at its bar, and produced the testimonials beforementioned, with his letters and orders, revised and approved by the lord primate of all Ireland, and other two Irish bishops, as appeared by their dockets and subscriptions. He then said that he had in a christian manner given them satisfaction that he was not a vagabond, but a canonically ordained clergyman of the communion of the church of Ireland, and as such he considered he was not subject to their jurisdiction, and therefore he declined their authority, and protested against any judgment they might pronounce¹."

HE WAS directed to dictate his protest to the clerk of court, which he did in the midst of a crowd of inveterate enemies as follows:—"Whereas, being an ordained minister of the church of England, and having been of that communion ever since, and now am; and having occasion to come and reside in my own country, where, for my benefit, and the benefit of those who were in the same circumstances with myself, I do, in my private house, keep divine worship, according to the rites of the church of England, and since by the union of the kingdoms, I do believe that the episcopal church of Scotland is now *incorporate* with the church of England, and

¹ True State of the Case, &c. p. 7.

though presbytery is the legal establishment of North Britain, yet I find there is no law against those of the communion of the church of England, to exercise their worship in a private manner, without intruding into any church or glebe of any minister established by law, and therefore I do not think myself subject or liable to any censure of any ecclesiastical judicatory in North Britain, but only so far as to give an account that I am a lawfully ordained minister, and free of any scandal that may incapacitate me for such an undertaking. And whereupon I take instruments."

THE PRESBYTERY condemned Mr. Greenshields because he had been ordained by an "exauctorate" bishop—because he had used "innovations" in public worship, contrary to the purity of theirs—and because he had denied the jurisdiction of their court. The validity of orders conferred by a disestablished bishop may be placed on a parallel footing with the "admissions" by "outed" presbyterian ministers; if the one be invalid, so is the other also; therefore all the "admissions" among the presbyterians from the year of grace, 1660, till the Revolution, were invalid. But the true motive for persecution was the use of the liturgy in public worship, which in the Assembly's acts is called "Innovations in public worship." The presbytery remitted the case to the civil power, and the city magistrates notified to him the sentence of the presbytery, and demanded if he chose to submit to it. He answered, that he could not consistently submit to the sentence of a court whose authority he had declined; upon which the magistrates discharged him to preach, under pain of imprisonment. Trusting, however, to the goodness and justice of his cause, because he had not offended against law, and having the example of Daniel before his eyes, in nearly a parallel case, he officiated as usual in his meeting-house on the following Sunday. On the preceding Saturday night, an anonymous letter was handed into his lodgings, which, in conclusion, contained these words, savouring of the principles of the *saints* who murdered archbishop Sharp:—"And therefore neither you nor those who own you will be suffered in your schismatical courses. The purity of the doctrine and worship of this church [this implies that the doctrine and worship of the church of England are impure] is what the people of this nation have contended and suffered much for; and they neither can nor will sit with your contempt of the same; and your scurrilous speeches of our blessed Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and your pretended friends, who make you their tool, shall not be able to

FORMS, rites, and ceremonies, in the worship of God in public assemblies, manifestly contrary to the foresaid purity and uniformity, which are established by the acts above mentioned, the introduction whereof was never so much as once attempted even during the late prelacy. Considering also that such *innovations* are *dangerous* to this church, and manifestly contrary to our Confession of Faith, founded on the word of God, and established by law, and unalterably secured to us by the foresaid Union, which Confession expressly declares, That nothing is to be admitted in the worship of God but what is prescribed in the Holy Scriptures. . . . THEREFORE . . . we, the said commission . . . do hereby discharge the practice of all such innovations in divine worship within this land, and earnestly obtest, and in the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ, exhort and beseech people of all ranks, carefully and conscientiously to avoid, and utterly to discountenance, all innovations in the worship of God, contrary to the purity and uniformity practised in this church¹.”

AFTER Mr. Greenshields had lain in gaol for some time, he presented a bill of suspension to the Court of Session, which narrates all that has been already recited, and then adds—“having been at the same time earnestly invited and desired by several persons here, who are of the communion of the church of England, *their native country*, and who did *not join* with the present established church here (so that no established minister’s charge was encroached upon): and having counsel and advice that there was no law to the contrary, so was prevailed upon to preach, and read prayers to these persons, after the forms of the church of England. And I engaged in this the more readily, when I considered that the presbyterian dissenting ministers in Ireland (where they have *no toleration* from the government, as in England), and who are, for the most part, Scotsmen, if they be qualified according to law, and preach and live as becomes them, are never disturbed by the regular clergy; but they enjoy the free exercise of religion after their own way almost in every parish: and I did expect that their brethren in Scotland would not do to others, what they would not have others do unto them.” He then proceeds to shew that neither the presbytery nor the magistrates had any ground in law; but their acts were most unwarrantable, for the following reasons:—1. Being a legally ordained minister and duly qualified, he was protected by the sixteenth act of parlia-

¹ Act of the Commission of the Kirk, cited in the True State of the Case, &c. p. 12.

ment of 1699, which prohibited and discharged any injury to be offered by any person whatsoever to any minister of the gospel, either in church or meeting-house; and therefore the sentence of imprisonment is illegal: for, 2, the only reason assigned for this injustice was his judicial acknowledgment of having read the English service. 3. He cited various acts of parliament to prove that his imprisonment was clearly illegal, and as it had no warrant from acts of parliament, so it could not possibly be warranted from any pretended act of the Commission of Assembly, *which has no legal power* to form or make any acts, especially with respect to those *without* their communion. 4. The depriving men of their liberty without a just and legal ground, is a horrid injustice; “and since my imprisonment (which has continued for nearly two months, to the great prejudice of my health, as well as of the means of subsistence of myself and numerous family), proceeds upon a sentence without the least warrant or any shadow of law, as appears from the premises:” therefore he besought their lordships that the foresaid prohibitions and sentences might be *simpliciter* suspended and himself set at liberty¹.

THIS REASONABLE request, however, was not granted, for reasons which Mr. Greenshields himself informs us in a letter addressed to a certain clergyman, but who is not named. It is dated Tolbooth of Edinburgh, December 5th, 1709.

“REVEREND SIR,—This is to inform you that since my last to you I have applied to the lords of our Session for my liberation, and gave in my bill of suspension, which I have here enclosed; but they, instead of considering what, in my humble opinion, regularly they ought to have considered, viz. the *cause* of my imprisonment alleged in the presbytery’s sentence, and that of the magistrates in pursuance thereof, and their warrant of imprisonment thereupon (all which I send you inclosed), namely, *my bringing rites and ceremonies into this place, contrary to the PURITY and UNIFORMITY of their worship*: I say, instead of considering this, the lords went off the state of the question, and finding no way to attack me, as I think, legally, fell upon a notion afforded them by the magistrates’ answer to my bill, and first broached by sir James Stewart [the lord advocate], ‘That no minister ordained by an *exauctorated* bishop,’ (for such they call all the right reverend bishops of this church), ‘has true ordination.’ What their lordships’ reasonings were upon this head, I design to publish at large;

¹ True State of the Case, 14-17.

and shall now only mention two of them. The first was of the lord M——o, who, after my lord Grange had asserted and fully proved the validity of my ordination, not only from the principles and practices of the church of England, but also of their own kirk, *learnedly* confuted all he had said by this one positive assertion, ‘ That an *exauctorated* bishop has *no more power to ordain a minister than a ballad-cryer in the streets !*’ and this was supported by another lord’s opinion, ‘ that he had no more power to ordain than a deposed colonel or captain of horse has to give commissions to subalterns !’ So that upon the whole, my bill was refused, and I bereft of all hopes that way ; so that I am forced to appeal to her majesty and the House of Lords, from whose great equity, moderation, and justice, I hope for that redress which I am so unhappy as not to be able to obtain in my native country. For, besides the hardship of my case in particular, I presume to say, if my persecutors are permitted to treat my episcopal brethren as they do, *ad libitum* and with impunity, I am afraid they will attempt the revival of their old Solemn League and Covenant. For that many of them think that still binding on them, the following instance, amongst many others, may evince. At Stirling, within these ten weeks, they were placing a minister ; Logan, who was the preacher, and examined the new intrant, asked him, among many other questions, in the church of Stirling, many hundreds present, ‘ whether he believed that the National, and Solemn League and Covenant, as it was binding upon their fathers who took it, so also it was equally binding upon them ?’ And he was answered, ‘ He believed it was ;’ which is downright *treason*, and contrary to many acts of parliament unrepealed. So that I think it may well be feared that that restless tribe, who are of this opinion, may once again attempt the reformation of the church of England to their model, and endeavour to propagate the same rebellious notions in the southern parts of the island. So that *a toleration* of episcopal ministers here seems to be highly necessary for the preservation of the peace and union of both kingdoms, the service of her majesty, and safety of the church happily established in England. As for the ministers of the other persuasion, whatever pretences they may make to loyalty, I can affirm, that there are *two* episcopal ministers, who have taken the oaths to her majesty for one of them, in proportion to their different numbers ; that before I came to this city, I heard nine of them preach and pray, and *never heard one of them* name the queen in their prayers. Nay, some of them had the insolence and hardness to tell their congregations, on the late thanksgiving

day appointed by her majesty and council, 'that they were not come there out of any obedience to the queen's proclamation; but to their synod, which had enjoined that thanksgiving for their good harvest.' (Signed) JAMES GREENSHIELDS¹."

THE WHOLE reformed catholic church of Great Britain and Ireland may be said to have been persecuted in the person of this intrepid priest; and, as in some degree their representative, he addressed the lords of council and session by petition, setting forth the grounds of his claim to regain his liberty. He first shews the invalidity of their assumption that he was not a true minister of the gospel, because he had been ordained by an "exauctorate bishop." He narrated the facts that have been already detailed, and asserted that there is no law against the performance of divine worship by a liturgy, and consequently there was no transgression. Neither was there any law or statute that empowered the present establishment to prosecute and judge one duly qualified to the government for having exercised the office of the ministry in a private way, being blameless in his life and orthodox in his doctrine. He took leave with submission to declaim against their sentence, upon the ground of their having pronounced him a layman and not a minister, because he had received ordination from an exauctorate bishop. He therefore proceeded—"to make it evident to your lordships, first, that the validity of my ordination was not the ground that regularly your lordships should have had under consideration at the advising of my said bill; and then, secondly, that my said ordination is as valid as the ordination of any other minister of the gospel whatsoever."

HE THEN relates the recognition and approbation of his orders, by the former and the present primate of all Ireland, and asserts his good affection to the queen, and his having taken all the oaths to her. This he considered a sufficient answer to the presbytery, whose summons only bore that he was to give "an account of himself." But the presbytery proceeded farther to question him with respect to some acts of the commission of the kirk; and he says, "I neither knowing nor being concerned to know any thing of these matters, they being no laws or statutes of this realm, nor being cited to any such purpose, I did therefore decline their jurisdiction; upon which they forthwith proceeded and gave sentence, discharging me to preach within the bounds of their

¹ True State of the Case, &c. 18, 19.

affect, far less to depose them from the exercise of these spiritual powers that are intrinsic to their office ; and in consequence of this, whatever spiritual powers they exercise among those who submit unto them, must needs be unexceptionably valid notwithstanding an act of state abolishing their order¹.”

BUT TO BRING the case nearer home to the present ecclesiastical powers ; those presbyterian ministers who deserted their charges in 1660, and were exauctorated by the civil power, never admitted that any deed of the state had deprived them of their ministerial powers. On the contrary, they continued to exercise all the parts of it ; but particularly in the imposition of hands, which they called “ admission ;” and the men so admitted preached and other ways acted as ministers and some of them were actually at that moment the parochial ministers, without having undergone any other solemnity in order to constitute them ministers.

THERE ARE, however, two things distinct in themselves to be considered ; but which, when confounded, occasion perplexity—the power itself, and the exercise of it. The first is of a spiritual nature, the gift of God, and which cannot be taken away by any civil magistrate whatever ; but the exercise of this spiritual power does fall under the magistrate’s regulation, who may encourage and prohibit it by granting it franchises and privileges. He may also make the exercise of this spiritual power penal, as he had done at that time, and inflict punishments for disobedience ; but his acts can never invalidate the deeds done in virtue of a power derived from God. The act that abolished episcopacy never touched the intrinsic spiritual powers of the bishops ; it only declared that the superiority of bishops over presbyters was no longer to be in the established kirk. The act could not denude the prelates of their spiritual powers, but only of their temporalities ; and they still continued to be bishops of the church catholic, notwithstanding the persecution that followed that act of parliament ; and all their deeds have been held valid, not only by the bishops of Ireland, in Mr. Greenshields’ case, but also by the bishops of England in many similar cases. Although the reformed catholic church, on good grounds, rejects the abuses that have been brought into the offices of ordination in the Roman church, as well as the other corruptions in her constitution, and although the pope and all popish bishops stand “ exauctorated ” by the laws of Great Britain and Ireland, yet the reformed catholic church accounts their ordin-

¹ True State of the Case, 22, 23.

tions valid. When a popish priest becomes sensible of the sinful corruptions of his church, and of its being in a state of schism in this country, and when he is received into the communion of the reformed catholic church, he neither receives rebaptization nor re-imposition of hands.

“WHEN, IN THAT case,” says Mr. Greenshields, “the ordination is not quarrelled, what reason can there be for calling in question an ordination performed by a protestant bishop, with the concurrence of other presbyters, according to the express rubric of the English ordinal by which it was performed, and according to the prescription whereof some presbyters were assisting and concurring also by their imposing of their hands, by which I became a minister of the catholic church, and have power to exercise my ministerial office within any part of the same? Farther, the presbyterian ministers themselves, who disown and decry the office of a bishop, will not dispute an exauctorate bishop’s right to be a *presbyter*, in virtue whereof, upon their own principles, he had power *qua presbyter*, with concurrence of other presbyters, to confer the power of the ministry; and upon the supposition that I were to enter and to be received into the communion of the established church of Scotland, it is humbly conceived that they would sustain my former ordination by the exauctorate bishop [of Ross] to be valid, and that they would not oblige me to receive imposition of hands from them *de novo*, whereof there be notorious instances; particularly of Mr. Guthrie, admitted by them a minister in Orkney, who had been ordained by an exauctorate bishop, as we can instance in others also¹.”

THE COURT OF SESSION had asserted that the act which re-dintegrated the estate of bishops, and the Assertory Act, that made the external government of the church dependent on the regal power, shewed that an act of parliament could deprive the bishops and clergy of their spiritual character as well as of their temporal endowments. This, however, is a principle that the presbyterians themselves would not have admitted in their own case. The power claimed by the king in that act for restoring and re-establishing bishops, was to the exclusion of any other foreign power, and a justification of the power then exercised by the king and parliament; and therefore that act does not pretend to confer any new right, but only to reintegrate the spiritual estate to their former just and legal rights, of which they had been unjustly and violently disseized. The error of the Act Assertory was re-

¹ True State of the Case, 22-24.

moved by Charles II., who, in his letter explanatory, solemnly declared that he never intended to entrench upon the intrinsic spiritual powers of the church or churchmen, which he allowed to be as fully and amply enjoyed by them as it was in the three first centuries of the church. But this new doctrine of the court of session, which subjected the spiritual power of churchmen so absolutely to the secular magistrate, as that by any act of the state they could be divested of their spiritual character, “is not only to join issue with Erastus, but to strain beyond him into the execrable principles of Hobbes¹.”

MR. GREENSHIELDS adds,—“From what is above represented, I presume it is evident that I have not usurped nor invaded the sacred office of the ministry without sufficient authority, which, had I done, I acknowledge that my punishment deserves to be greater than what I have met with; that being, indeed, an iniquity that ought to be punished by the judge. So that the only thing that can be laid against me is the performing of the service of the church of England within this city, to which I hope it is a sufficient answer, that there is no law or statute against it; and my doing of it, upon the account of some people of the English nation, residing or trading here, who being educated in the communion of the church of England, and so were not acquainted with any other form, to whom it were hard to deny that liberty, makes my case the more favourable; especially since it was no new thing in this place—I having seen and known that form of worship practised and observed within this city, in several places, for upwards of twenty years past. And even since the Revolution, so little doubt was made of the English service being allowable here, that sir James Leslie, colonel of an English regiment, had his chaplain still attending him, and in many towns publicly officiating by that service, and particularly at Stirling: he possessed himself of the west church, for the more convenient and solemn performance; and this was not so much as grudged or complained of, though the law had just then established the presbyterian government and worship. And that the same was very publicly used during the reign of Charles II. in his own palace of Holyrood-house, for the use of her present majesty when her father resided here; and the same was also used in the public offices of the consecration of bishops, and ordination of ministers, when the service and forms of the English Liturgy were made use of in the cathedral churches of St.

¹ True State of the Case, 25.

Andrews, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and the others; and was, with very great advantage (as it is at this day), made use of as the public form of devotion in sundry families of quality in this North Britain; and therefore to punish a protestant minister with so long imprisonment, that is duly qualified for using the English service to Englishmen whose stations or private business gave them ground to stay here, cannot but seem very hard; whereas, in those places where the Romish Inquisition prevails, English protestants, and their form of worship, finds better quarters than they do here in North Britain; for her majesty's troops in Spain and Portugal are allowed the free exercise of their religion, which is denied to her majesty's servants here, when he who did officiate to them is thus treated¹."

"THIS LONG-CONTINUED practice," he continues, "both before the Revolution and since, of using the English Service by all who wish it in this nation, is founded upon an indisputable maxim of divinity, and I presume of law also; which is, that what is lawful and not forbidden, is permitted; and this I take to be the case of the English Service to this day. Neither does the using of the English Service clash with any law establishing uniformity of worship, or the Act of Union ratifying it; for those acts most clearly relate only to the presbyterian church *within* herself, and not to those who are without her. Those acts do, indeed, secure the presbyterian church from having any innovation of worship imposed on her, but are no ways inconsistent with another form of worship being used by others out of her communion. By this Act of Union the church of England has the very same security for her government, policy, and form of worship, as the presbyterians have here for theirs; and seeing the practising another form of worship without the church of England, while no innovation is made upon that church within herself, is understood to be very inconsistent with the security of her worship, and the Act of Union ratifying it, it is not then to be understood how the very parallel practice here should be reckoned an innovation, and derogate from the security of the presbyterian form of worship, or interfere in the least with the Act of Union ratifying it; both churches being upon the same footing, and having the very same mutual security against any change of their government and policy, or any innovation of worship. Imprisonment being the restraint of natural liberty, is amongst the severest of arbitrary punishments, and no ways founded in law; but to imprison a person *sine die* is contrary to law, and

¹ True State of the Case, 25, 26.

is one of the grievances complained of in the Claim of Right and my case is no better, the condition of my liberation being such as I cannot fulfil without declaring myself unworthy the holy character I bear. Although others may put a restraint upon me, yet I can by no means do it myself. Suppose then I were called to administer the sacrament of baptism, or the Lord's Supper, to persons *in extremis*, where no other minister could be had in due time, I could neither answer to God nor to my own conscience, to refuse baptism, or the Lord's Supper, in that case; and yet if I should put a restriction upon myself, I could not do it. From all which it may appear the severity wherewith I am used, by so long a confinement so very disproportionate to my alleged offence—especially having *no foundation in law*—and now in an united kingdom should be far less used than formerly¹."

MR. LOCKHART says, that Greenshields applied for the benefit of the *habeas corpus* law, "and being refused the same unless he found bail never to exercise any part of his ministerial office in the city of Edinburgh, his next recourse was to the lords of session, before whom he brought an action of wrongous imprisonment against the magistrates; but their sentence being affirmed by that court, he then appealed to the queen and parliament." It does not appear that he brought any action against the magistrates, but only that he petitioned the lords of session against their decision. He prayed them to re-consider his case; to examine the reasons assigned by the magistrates for their sentence with the reasons he offered for suspension, and to take another view of the power of ordination. This they not only declined to do, but confirmed the sentence passed by the magistrates. He, by his attorney, Wm Allan, "protested for remedy of law, and appealed from them to the queen's majesty and House of Lords, for justice and redress²." This protest and appeal is dated December the 29th when he was still in prison.

I HAVE DWELT the longer on Mr. Greenshields' case, because his moral courage and intrepidity were the immediate cause of producing some degree of toleration to the episcopalians, and of permission to use the Liturgy in their public worship, under the protection of an act of parliament. The late bishop of Glasgow has very justly observed, "that it is *fortunate* for the reputation of the presbyterian church of Scotland that she has never been invested with such power as would have enabled her to reduce to practice her speculative

¹ True State of the Case, 26, 27.

² Ibid. 31, and Lockhart Papers.

views as to the duty of driving from the land all heresy and schism¹." If she had possessed the power, the impugning of extemporary prayer and the use of a liturgy would have been her burning points; for of no heresy or schism did she appear to have so great a horror. Wodrow mentions, in one of his letters to a friend, dated November 23d—"You have, no doubt, heard of the missionaries the episcopal clergy sent lately to court with an address for a toleration (as is said), and the duke of Queensberry's refusal to present it to the queen, and their returning. I hear they design to present it to the House of Commons. We had here a rumour of an address that was a framing among some of our nobility and gentry in the West, to the parliament, for restoring of patronages; but for any thing I know of, it is like to meet with cold entertainment among the most part, and I hear is let fall. I have *very lamentable accounts*, by letters, from some of our brethren in Angus, of the sad state of things there. The [episcopal] meeting-houses are increasing, and *they bury their dead with the Liturgy*, and *the clergy* [officiate] *with their habits*, and the nobility and gentry are *very fond* of these new fashions; and though application be made to the court, yet no redress is like to be got. I am persuaded (if God's providence prevent it not) the court, in the issue, will come to feel the effects of this jacobite and French faction, that set up for these *innovations*, from no strait of conscience, but merely to embroil the country, and alienate people's affections from the present establishment, if they do not notice it in time²."

By a LETTER from Mr. Maxwell, minister at Tealing, near Dundee, to Mr. Wodrow, dated November the 7th, we have still more satisfactory accounts of the progress that the public use of the Liturgy was making. He says,—“Matters grow worse and worse. The English Service *continues* with us, and that Liturgy is in great vogue and esteem with many amongst us, especially our gentry, who seem to be disposed to receive any thing that is against the established church, her doctrine, worship, and government, and that is against that truth that is according to godliness. Our great folks observe now the funeral rites in burying their dead relations. Lately, the lord Glammis, son to the earl of Strathmore, had these rites punctually observed and performed by, I may say, all the prelatie clergy in Angus, who, being invited to his funeral (but not a presbyterian minister), did attend in their canonick gowns,

¹ History of the Church in Scotland, ii. 394.

The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, i. p. 77.

and the greatest part of our gentry admired and commended that way. Though we complain of these things to magistrates, who by office should take course with these *innovations*, we are not heard, and we expect no service to this church from the new lord-advocate. He has scored out of the Porteous roll all intruders, preachers in meeting-houses, and others; so that we can get nothing done against them: they are strengthened and encouraged by him and others to commit these disorders, and our hearts are discouraged, and our hands weakened. The prelatie party is much encouraged by him, and they turn very insolent. I cannot but let you know a late instance:—One Mr. Skinner, once episcopal minister in Brechin, being deposed by the presbytery of Brechin for insufficiency, heterodoxy, profanation of the Lord's Supper, by admitting scandalous persons thereto, &c., he did appeal from them to our synod in October last, and the synod, after a very long and serious consideration of his very prolix process, did see cause to approve and confirm the presbytery's sentence of deposition; and when this was intimated to him, he did give in a signed appeal from our synod to the queen's majesty and the House of Peers . . . and in express terms he declined all the judicatories of the presbyterian church of Scotland. The which appeal was rejected by the synod. . . . This gentleman had declined the presbytery before as his judges. The Sabbath after the synod had so determined, he did not preach in Brechin; but the second Sabbath he mounted the pulpit in an insolent manner, had a great backing of country gentlemen and other disaffected persons, who assisted him; and the minister who was sent to preach was hindered, and pursued by school-boys and others from the church. . . . As we have many discouragements from without us, so we want not many from within. Iniquity *abounds* amongst us; the love of many waxeth cold—great deadness—security, seizes this generation. The gospel seems to have little success. That wonted zeal, love to God and to His ordinances, fruitfulness in grace, loveliness, &c. *are not to be found*¹."

DR. SACHEVEREL preached the sermon on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot, wherein he charged the queen's ministers with being *false brethren* to the church of which they pretended to be members. A majority of the court of aldermen were opposed to its publication; but the doctor published it, relying on the private encouragement of the lord mayor, On December the 13th, the House of Commons resolved, that

¹ Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 79—81.

e sermon preached by Dr. Sacheverel at the assizes at Derby, the 15th of August last, and the sermon preached by him at St. Paul's, on the 5th of November, were malicious, scandalous, and seditious libels, highly reflecting upon her majesty and her government, the late Revolution, the protestant succession, &c. The doctor was brought to the bar on the 14th, acknowledged the sermons to be his, and that he was encouraged by sir Samuel Garrard, the lord mayor, to print that of the 5th of November; but the lord mayor denied that he ordered or encouraged the printing of it. The doctor was impeached at the bar of the House of Lords, of high crimes and misdemeanours¹.

1710.—ON THE 13th of January articles of impeachment were carried up to the Lords against Dr. Sacheverel, of which the following is the substance:—1. That the doctor did suggest and maintain that the necessary means used to bring about the Revolution were odious and unjustifiable.—2. That the Toleration was unreasonable, and the allowance of it unarrantable.—3. That the church of England was in a state of great peril and adversity under her majesty's administration.—4. That her majesty's administration, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs, tended to the destruction of the constitution. The trial commenced before the House of Peers at Westminster Hall, on the 27th February, when her majesty was present *incognita* during the whole trial. On March the 1st the mob that attended the doctor to his trial, attacked Dan Rogers's presbyterian meeting-house, pulled down the pulpit and pews, and made a bonfire of them in Lincoln's Inn-fields. They also attacked and injured all the other presbyterian meeting-houses, and insulted several of the members of parliament. The trial lasted so long, that the Lent assizes were postponed, on account of the judges being engaged on the doctor's trial. There was a powerful array of the crown council against Dr. Sacheverel, and several of the members spoke for prosecution; one of them, general Stanhope, said, "that Dr. Sacheverel had preached his sermon in a conventicle of dissipated persons, maintained by some deluded women, no notice should have been taken of so nonsensical and incoherent a discourse: but that true son of ——— the church, that significant tool of a party, having preached this sermon in a place where it might do great mischief . . . his offence deserved the severest animadversion." This epithet gave the doctor great offence, and he noticed it in his speech, which

¹ Salmon's Chronological Historian, i. 365.

was a very able and a very long one. He was supported by able counsel; but his own speech effected a greater diversion in his favour. He said,—“The doctrine I preached being the doctrine of the homilies of our church, not expressed only in a few particular passages of those homilies, but perfectly agreeable to the whole tenor, the main scope and design of them; and those homilies being established by the Thirty-nine Articles as containing godly and wholesome doctrine and those Articles being confirmed by the 13th of queen Elizabeth, and that statute being made *perpetual and fundamental* to our constitution by the late Act of Union, I leave it to your lordships to consider how far the condemnation of me, on the account of that doctrine, may affect and shake the present frame of the British constitution in church and state and tend to dissolve the union of the two kingdoms. . . . So far was I from having any of those wicked, malicious, or seditious designs which are laid to my charge, that my intention were, on the contrary, to instil *the principles of loyalty and obedience* into my fellow-subjects, and withal to put a stop to that torrent of lewdness, irreligion, and atheism, of which I have given your lordships so many flagrant testimonies. . . . And when I consider that I now stand and am judged for some of the doctrines of that gospel which God delivered unto our fathers, and you, my lords the bishops, their successors have received from Christ and his apostles, as the sacred depositum of the church, to be maintained inviolably in its primitive simplicity; when I consider what is the cause ‘for which I am this day called in question,’ that it is one of those eternal truths which you are so solemnly commissioned to teach, and ‘earnestly contend for;’ when I consider that it is what Our Blessed Lord and his apostles sealed with the most precious blood, and so many primitive martyrs maintained even in the midst of the flames, so many learned bishops and confessors recommended to posterity in their immortal writings, as the distinguished badge and glory of our Reformation: nay, when I consider that it is what you yourselves have already supported with incontestible reason and authority, it is no small satisfaction to me to think, that as your lordships are my judges, so I hope you must be my advocates. What a guilt, as well as a disgrace, would it justly devolve upon the clergy, to recede from any principle of our excellent church, especially from what has been so long retained and boasted of as its peculiar character? By abandoning which we must relapse into some of the worst doctrines, even popery itself, and render ourselves the most contemptible, and

well as inconsistent, church in the world. . . . I hope it appears that I am not guilty of any of the crimes of which I am accused; that I have transgressed no law of the land, neither statute nor common law, relating either to her majesty or to my fellow-subjects, to the church or to the state: and that I may, with all humility, apply to my own case the words of that blessed apostle, whose doctrine I defend, and whose example I hope I shall have the grace to follow—‘neither against the law, nor against the temple, nor against Cæsar, have I offended any thing at all¹.’”

THERE WERE long and powerful debates in the House of Lords; but my lord Haversham’s speech, in the Doctor’s favour, was among the best. He said, when I consider where this impeachment began, I cannot but think the design of it was very good; but whatever it was in its first intendment, it is very evident it has already procured very mischievous effects; it has created great disturbances in private families, and raised a ferment in the nation, that will not be laid by your lordship’s judgment, let it be what it will. It has been a two-edged mischief; giving the church, on the one side, and the dissenters, on the other, too just apprehension that they are both in danger. Nor can this be wondered at, when your lordships have been told by some of the managers of a *pretended* divine right of the church, and when it has been more than hinted by the managers of the House of Commons, that the clergy *ought to be directed by the civil power what doctrine they should preach*: nay, when they have authoritatively taken it upon them to interpret Scripture, and charge it as a crime upon a minister, that he had wrested several places of it to his own wicked intentions. . . . I shall not trouble your lordships about the original of government, or the divers forms of it; but there is one thing . . . that I take to be of the greatest consequence to any government whatsoever; I mean the *divine appointment or institution of government*. From which appointment it is that men are *obliged to obedience to the magistrate*, not only for wrath or fear of him, but for conscience-sake, for dread of a future punishment, which is the greatest security the magistrate hath. And I the rather mention this, because of notions that some people have of late advanced of their own (and have found their advantage, too, in so doing), of a *discretionary obedience only*; that is, in my opinion, whilst the government is for *them* they will be for *it*, and think themselves bound to obey no longer. After so noble a defence made for

¹ Boyer’s History of Queen Anne, folio, pp. 420—426.

the Doctor by his counsel, and so great and moving an apology by himself, I should not trouble your lordships upon occasion, were it not more in justification of myself for judgment I shall give, than for the sake of the Doctor, whose cause, I think, now stands in very little need of it ¹.”

ON MARCH 30th, the Doctor was called to the bar of the House of Lords to receive sentence, when he put in a plea that indeed lord Nottingham had urged in his favour, that the particular words supposed to be criminal ought to have been specified in the articles of impeachment. After a long debate this plea was voted *frivolous*. Sixty-nine peers declared the Doctor guilty, and fifty-two not guilty; and the usher of the black rod having brought him to the bar, and placed him on his knees, the lord chancellor pronounced his judgment—“Henry Sacheverel, doctor in divinity, shall be, and is hereby enjoined not to preach during the term of three years next ensuing. That Dr. Henry Sacheverel’s two printed sermons referred to by the impeachment of the House of Commons shall be burnt before the Royal Exchange in London, between the hours of twelve and one on Monday, the 27th day of instant March, by the hands of the common hangman, in the presence of the lord mayor of the city of London, and the sheriffs of London and Middlesex ².” This was a disagreeable service to the lord mayor, who had secretly encouraged the Doctor to publish his sermon, and he begged off from attending the degrading ceremony. Whilst their hands were in, they ordered some other books to be burnt by means of the same functionary—The Oxford decrees, entitled, “An Exact Confutation of Mr. Hoadley’s Book of the Original of Government—A Collection of Passages referred to by Dr. Sacheverel in his Answer to the Articles of Impeachment—The Rights of the Christian Church asserted—A Defence of the Rights of the Church—and A Treatise on the word *Person*.” The hangman presided accordingly at this conflagration, and the books were publicly burnt ³. The Rights of the Church and its Defence most righteously deserved this infamy; they were the works of a jesuit, who was at the same time an infidel, but they have happily sunk into oblivion, and live only in the multiplicity of refutations that they received by almost all the authors of the period. The public considered the Doctor’s sentence rather as an acquittal than as a condemnation, and as “a sure indica-

¹ *Ut supra*, pp. 429, 430.

² *Ut supra*, 444-45.—Salmon’s Chronological Historian, 364-367.

³ Salmon’s Chronological Historian, i. 367.

of the impotence of the whig party." His friends made extraordinary rejoicings upon it, and most of the streets in Westminster, and some in the city, were illuminated; bonfires were made on the streets, and the Doctor's health and "happy deliverance" were drank by the people round them. In May, says Mr. Salmon, "Dr. Sacheverel entered upon his triumphant progress to Shropshire. He was magnificently entertained at Oxford by the university; and received in the other great towns he passed through with the loud acclamations and joyful congratulations of the people upon his deliverance from whiggish persecution¹." He was entertained by all the nobility and gentry in the line of his route. He was conducted into Shrewsbury by all the neighbouring gentlemen, and about five thousand men on horseback. On entering Bridgenorth, the clergy and gentry met him at the head of four thousand horse, and near three thousand foot, "most of them with white knots edged with gold, and three leaves of gilt laurel, in their hats; the hedges two miles from the town being dressed with flowers, and lined with people; and the two steeples adorned with fifty pounds worth of flags and colours²."

BISHOP ROSE governed the suffering church of Scotland by a wise and peaceable deportment, and with all the dignity of character that belonged to a primitive bishop, by virtue of those spiritual powers that devolved upon him as vicar-general of the province of St. Andrews. He corresponded with his old friends, Dr. Sharpe, archbishop of York, and Dr. Compton, bishop of London, who always retained a particular esteem and respect for him. Soon after the change of ministry, when the prospects of the church in both kingdoms were improved, he received a letter from Oxford, desiring to know "whether or not he and the rest of the Scottish bishops were in communion, as matters now stood with the established church of England and her bishops?" It is evident from the style of his letter that bishop Rose did not, upon political grounds, think the communion was complete; but without having any opportunity of consulting his brethren, the primate cautiously answered—"I know there has been a division among the members of the church of England upon that head. The controversy is great and material, and our circumstances among ourselves not affording such difficulties, the most of us, perchance, have not so carefully examined that matter, and want the needful helps to be fully instructed in it. And for

¹ Salmon's Chronological Historian, ii. p. 2.

² Boyer's History of Queen Anne, 679.

myself, it cannot be expected of me, that without a previous conference with my brethren, and considering that subject thoroughly and maturely with them, I should give my sense of it¹."

TOLERATION is not a feature of presbytery; but on the contrary, the persecution and extirpation of the holy catholic church is one of its fundamental principles. The case of Mr. Greenshields was so notorious an instance of this principle, that it occasioned universal abhorrence when brought before the British parliament. That case reflects the greatest disgrace on the presbyterians, and shews their ignorance of true religion and of christian principles. Their ignorance was most luminously displayed in solemnly asserting from the judicial bench that the bishop of Ross was incapable of performing the holy functions of his apostolic office, and had no more power of ordination than a ballad singer!—because he had been deprived of his temporalities, plundered of his revenues, and reduced from his legal and constitutional station to a state of poverty and suffering. This was, indeed, to "homologate" erastianism, as making the divine character of the apostolic office proceed from the civil magistrate. With an equal degree of truth, they might have "exauctorated" St. Paul, the renowned founder of the British church, because he met from the civil magistrate stripes above measure, frequent imprisonments, and stonings—because he thrice suffered shipwreck, was in multitudes of perils, weariness, painfulness, watchings, hunger, thirst, fastings, cold, and nakedness. They might as well have concluded that he had no more "the care of all the churches" than a discharged captain of dragoons had to grant commissions in the army. Notwithstanding all his sufferings, and his "exauctoration" at the hand of the magistrate, he magnified his office, declared himself equal to the chiefest apostles, and infinitely superior to those *false* apostles and sectarian teachers by whom he was persecuted and the church infested and rent into sects that held men's persons in admiration. But we may apply the words of Jerome to Evagrius to the present case:—"Wheresoever a bishop shall be, whether at Rome or Eugubium, or at Constantinople or Rhegium, or at Alexandria or Tanis [or in Scotland], he is of the same merit and priesthood; the power of riches and the humility of poverty doth not make a bishop higher or lower, *but they are all the SUCCESSORS of the APOSTLES.*"

CHAPTER LXI.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RIGHT REV. ALEXANDER ROSE, D.D.
VICAR GENERAL OF THE PROVINCE OF ST. ANDREWS.

1710.—Mr. Greenshields—presents his petition to parliament.—Change of ministry—the prime minister opposed to Greenshields—his petition read—his sentence reversed, and the magistrates ordered to pay his costs.—Letter from bishop Nicolson—some interesting particulars.—Meeting of Assembly.—A fast.—Attempts to suppress the liturgy.—Extract of a letter from an English officer.—King's College, Aberdeen—correspondence between the lord advocate and the principal—a petition from the inhabitants.—1711.—The reversal of Greenshields' sentence creates great dissatisfaction.—Faculty of advocates and the duchess of Gordon.—College of bishops.—Bishop Sage—some account of him—his death—character.—Consecration of bishop Campbell.—Opposition to the settlement of ministers.—1712, called a "*black*" year.—Bill for the repeal of the act against irregular baptisms—the commission petitions against the repeal—their intolerance—opposition—repeal of the act against irregular baptisms—abridgement of the act.—Bishop Campbell.—Dr. Gadderar's consecration at London.—Bill for the restoration of patronage and Christmas vacation—opposition by the commission—the bill passed both houses.—Bishops' rents given to the church.—The liturgy in general use.—Death of the princess Louisa—and of Richard Cromwell.—Distress of the clergy—subscriptions in England.—Oath of Abjuration.—Importance of a word.—Dr. Carstares' speech—remarks.—Tricks of the jesuits.—The liturgy.—Assembly.—Prevalence of the liturgy.—Oath of abjuration.—Patronage—seal against it.—1713.—Confirmation restored.—Bishop Rose's letter—remarks.—Rev. Robert Cockburn—officiates in the churchyard—prevented from repeating it.—General Assembly.—Abjuration oath.—A consecration in London.—A thanksgiving.—Public opinion partially turned toward the exiled prince.—Dr. Sacheverel.—Petition for repeal of the Union.—Death of princess Sophia.—Bill to bestow the bishops' revenues on the clergy.—1714.—An assembly.—Address to the queen.—Increase of popery.—Death of queen Anne.—Act of Toleration.—Reflections.

1710.—THE DATE of Mr. Greenshields' release from prison is not mentioned, only we are informed that the magistrates "discharged him from prison when they were tired of keeping him in it." In prosecution of the appeal that he had made to the House of Lords he went up to London; but the house

being then wholly occupied with the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverel, his petition could only be received that session, and his appeal lodged. By their late tyrannical attempt to suppress the catholic and loyal doctrines of the church of England in the person of Dr. Sacheverel, the whigs had roused the ancient spirit of the people. The queen partook of the same feeling, and deprived the earl of Sunderland of the seals. The high church party extolled her majesty "for setting herself free from an arbitrary junta, that kept her in an inglorious dependence on their will and caprice;" and the duke of Beaufort told her majesty that "he was extremely glad he could now salute her as queen." Mr. Harley was soon after advanced to the head of affairs. He endeavoured to persuade Mr. Greenshields' friends to let the appeal drop. Mr. Lockhart says that Mr. Harley said to him, "that he was much surprised and very sorry to hear that I and others of my country were so violent in pushing Mr. Greenshields' appeal, which could not fail to be attended with bad consequences, as the church party in England would take it ill if he was not protected, and the Scots presbyterians would highly resent any favour he met with, and therefore he . . . desired it might be dropped till a more proper season. I answered, that I could assure him we were much mistaken if any bad consequences happened from supporting Mr. Greenshields in his just plea for the contrary was designed by those who pushed it:—that the Scots presbyterians were as much exasperated already as they could be, and had neither ability nor courage to give any disturbance, for their interest in the country was very small as sufficiently appeared from the great majority of tories in this parliament, which he knew was not owing to any assistance they got from the court, but arose wholly from the inclination of the people:—that as for himself he had no reason to shew them any favour, for they preached and prayed against his *nominatim*, giving him over to the gallows and the devil from their pulpits, and I was confident, at least hopeful, he would never give them reason to have a better opinion of him: . . . we were rather worse than better since the change of the ministry, as the lord Grange, brother to the earl of Marr, who was lately made justice clerk, seemed more violent than his predecessor against the episcopal clergy¹."

MR. HARLEY did all he possibly could to induce Mr. Greenshields and his friends to withdraw his appeal; but they were resolute to bring the tyranny and malevolence against the

¹ Lockhart Papers, 4to. i. p. 347.

episcopalians under the notice of the British parliament; and Mr. Greenshields was maintained with money to defray an expense that was totally beyond his slender means. And, continues Mr. Lockhart, "when the day prefixed for discussing the appeal drew near, they [the Scots commons] divided themselves into several classes, to each of which was assigned a certain number of English lords, on whom they waited, and gave a true and clear representation of the case, which had so much weight, and produced such good effects, that the under-hand dealings of the ministry were entirely baffled; for the appeal was heard, the sentence of the lords of session *reversed*, and the city of Edinburgh ordered *to pay swinging costs* to Mr. Greenshields, to which the ministry themselves were obliged to give their approbation, not daring to expose their reputations by appearing openly against an affair of this nature and consequence¹."

A LETTER from bishop Nicolson, of Carlisle, to archbishop Wake, gives some interesting accounts of the state of the episcopalians in Scotland at this time. It is dated Rose Castle, May 25th, 1710.—". . . My chaplain is lately returned from making the grand tour in Scotland; where he found as warm doings as we have in England [about Dr. Sacheverel]. The greatest numbers of the episcopalians continue under the direction and influence of the exauctorate bishop of Edinburgh, who is entirely in the interest of the Pretender, and will allow none of his followers to pray for the queen, notwithstanding that himself owns her title in the receipts he gives for his pension. Hence in most of their meeting-houses, *wherein our liturgy is used*, those collects and petitions in the Litany wherein supplications are made for her majesty and the royal family are mangled and curtailed in a very gross and scandalous manner. And these men are as inveterate enemies to Greenshields as the Assembly itself. They dread the ruin of their own party upon the prevalency of our Common Prayer: and good reason they have for it. There are now a hundred and thirteen episcopal presbyters in possession of parochial cures, whereof only eleven are non-jurors: whereas of the old covenanted race of presbyterians, there are about four times that number, who (though they never pray for the queen, nor have ever taken the oath of allegiance to her) are overlooked and winked at by the General Assembly. I doubt not but you have seen the address which the moderator and his brethren sent up on occasion of lord Glasgow's being again

¹ Lockhart Papers, p. 349.

nominated commissioner; wherein they fairly avow the principles on which their fore-elders built the gude wark of reformation, which (ye ken) were not over-burthened with the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance. This day fourthnight the Assembly passed a gracious act in favour of the regal supremacy; which (by a majority of three voices in the question) is allowed henceforward to have a concurrency of powers with those of the Assembly itself. So as that the latter has an indisputable authority in appointing fasts and feasts. The crown is also acknowledged to have the like. A mighty point gained ¹."

THE ASSEMBLY met on the 26th of April, lord Glasgow, commissioner, and Mr. William Mitchel was chosen moderator. The queen's letter presented nothing new; but the Assembly in their reply insolently reminded her majesty that her only title to the throne rested in their Claim of Right, which was purposely inserted to mark their abhorrence of her hereditary right, and of the doctrines of the church of England, as propounded by Dr. Sacheverel. They, however, took upon them to make an act ordaining a solemn fast to be observed throughout the kingdom, without consulting the government². This, as Hetherington says, occasioned "a slight jar between the church and the departing administration." Lord Sunderland wrote to Mr. Carstares, acquainting him with the queen's displeasure at this interference with her prerogative, as hinted at above by the bishop of Carlisle. Her majesty, however, consented to give authority to the Assembly's act, and his lordship says, "I hope the Assembly will be very sensible of her majesty's goodness in condescending to interpose the civil sanction to their act; for which, it must be owned, there was no occasion, the government not having been wanting hitherto in any thing necessary for promoting either the civil or religious concerns of the people; so that, if we could see into the views of some who, perhaps, have been most active and zealous for this step, we should probably find them different from what they appear to be, and to fall but too much in with the like humour here, which has already raised so great a ferment. . . . And I dare not promise you, if the Assembly should offer again at the like step, that they will meet with the same easiness and compliance in the government: and therefore I hope it will be the care and study of the cautious and prudent of the ministers, to keep them as much as possible from unnecessarily asserting of their authority and privileges, which

¹ Ellis's Original Letters, v. iii. 358-360.

² Acts of Assembly, 442.

is what their enemies desire above all things they should ; and which cannot fail to bring that upon them they seem so much to apprehend from the union¹."

THE VERY GENERAL use of the liturgy in the episcopalian congregations appears to have spread the utmost consternation among the presbyterians ; and Mr. Carstares had much correspondence with the whig administration to induce them to interpose the civil authority to prohibit its use. We can only gather from the answers what Carstares' complaints in name of the commission had been ; but her majesty is made to express her approbation of the authorities who prevented general Whiteman's regiment from having the liturgy read to them by their own chaplain ! The complaints seem to have been frequent and vehement, for by a letter from Mr. Pringle to Carstares, he strongly urges him not to proceed with their persecution of the clergy on this account ; for, says he, "if they give full obedience to the civil government, what objection can be made to their claims of the same privilege and liberty, as dissenters from the established church in the north, that the dissenters from the established church here are allowed ? And for my own part, if ever their pretensions to this come to be formally talked in parliament, I am much afraid they will *be found of weight* . . . the more notice is taken of them in the way of opposition and censure, the better interest they have for trying the interest and strength of their friends here ; and therefore . . . the less notice the church takes of these people, who set up the English liturgy, the better. I do not believe they will gain many proselytes to that way in that country ; and when the present set of these ministers is worn out, which they must do daily, I do not believe the *plentiful allowance* which has been made for them, since they were *turned out* of their churches, has tempted many to qualify themselves to continue a succession to them²." This was written as a man of the world, little knowing the christian heroism that prompted men to enter into the ministry, notwithstanding the "plentiful allowance" to which he satirically alludes. A Mr. Chamberlayne, writing to Carstares, inveighs most bitterly against the presbyterians for their bigotted zeal against the English chaplains for using the service of the church of England in their regiments. He complains of their great severity against them for reading to their own people only, and says, "it is so like the inquisition that it must needs raise an indignation in the minds of good christians³." M'Cormick ingenuously gives

¹ Carstares' State Papers, 785-86.

² Ibid. 773.

³ Ibid. 783.

an extract of a letter from an English officer at Edinburgh to his friend at London, as follows :—" I was all my life a moderate man as to the dispute between the two grand parties, and could at any time have heard a good sermon from either ; but really I have seen so much *violence and inveteracy* from the presbyterian party here, against the church of England in particular, and the nation in general, that *it almost turns my stomach* ; and if any thing makes me a highflier it will be the *unreasonable bitter invectives, and prodigious imprecations*, which I have with my own ears heard from some too zealous presbyterian clergy *in their pulpits here, against the church of England*. I wish they would manage with more christian moderation ; for while both parties run so high, we can never expect an union in all its parts. Though our chaplain was here, yet he was *not suffered* to preach ; which is what we were never denied in the most rigid Roman catholic countries. The episcopal party here being suppressed, or disaffected to the government, and most of their clergy refusing to pray for our gracious queen Anne, so palls my inclinations towards them, that for the future I resolve to stay at home, and pray in private ; or at least make a congregation of my own company, and pray with and for them, till God is pleased to send a better and more public spirit into mankind ¹.

THE EARL OF ERROLL was chancellor of King's College, Aberdeen ; and by the authority of his office he directed the liturgy to be read in the college chapel. Some zealots had applied to the lord advocate to suppress this "innovation," and his lordship wrote to Dr. Middleton, who appears to have been still the principal, and had not been purged out, directing him to shut up the chapel, and not to permit the use of the liturgy in it. In his reply, Dr. Middleton pleaded the chancellor's authority, and his own inability to resist it. The lord advocate wrote to him from York, saying, " I did very roundly give a return by Mr. Forbes, your agent, and hoped to have heard from you before I came from Edinburgh an account of the shutting up of your chapel. But I am sorry to hear that matters take another turn amongst you, and that the students are so far engaged in the matter as to dream of addressing the queen on the subject. This will have quite contrary effects to what some men imagine ; for the danger of setting up a new form in the chapel belonging to the college was chiefly lest the youth should be *infected* with the desire of novelty, and with sentiments prejudicial to the established

¹ Carstares' State Papers, 783-84.

laws of their country ; and it must needs draw censure upon their masters that they have, by their connivance and without public authority, entered into such a measure. I had the memorial to which your letter refers. . . . I take the liberty once more, as a friend, to inform you, that it was unfit from the beginning, for any college in the universe to have presumed to have allowed their chapel to be made use of as a meeting-house, and much less one so much different and new even in the sense of Scots episcopacy ; for however the service and ceremonies may pretend to antiquity *elsewhere*, it must be owned to be a novelty with us. . . . By the 17th act of parliament, 1690, it is enacted, that none be allowed to continue in the exercise of their functions in schools and colleges but such as are not only pious, loyal, &c. but even submitting to the church as established by law ; and nothing can be more contrary to that submission than the bestowing of your chapel in the manner that you have done, of which the appearance made by the students is but an effect, and chargeable entirely on the masters as the cause. . . . There can be no excuse offered but what will as well justify the setting up any different religion in a chapel belonging to the university. I hope you will believe my plainness upon this occasion proceeds from my tenderness for you and your college, and to prevent any inquiry as to what is past, which I think the shutting up of your chapel may do ; otherwise you may expect that other methods will be taken ; and to confirm you in this mind, I send you the abstract of a letter from the secretary of state upon this subject." The abstract from the earl of Sunderland's letter makes her majesty speak language essentially different from her known principles :—" I had your lordship's letter of the 17th of December some days in my hands, and having laid the contents of it before the queen, her majesty is very well satisfied with the orders you have given for shutting up the chapel of the college of Aberdeen, and I am, by her majesty's orders, to assure your lordship that you cannot do more acceptable service than to discourage and discountenance such innovations as these¹."

IMMEDIATELY on the shutting up of this chapel, the inhabitants of Old Aberdeen prepared a petition, and transmitted it to the queen, shewing her majesty the persecution to which

¹ Taken from a manuscript copy of several old Tracts in the possession of the Rev. James Christie, author of the Oblation and Invocation in the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated.

they were subjected, and praying to be relieved from. Notwithstanding, they say, “ the repeated assurances we have got of your majesty’s protection in the exercise of our religion, yet, to our great surprise, an order is lately come from your majesty’s advocate in North Britain to shut our chapel, for no other reason, whatever may be pretended, because we make use of the liturgy of the church of Scotland. . . . We never doubted, but seeing we could not with a clear conscience join with the church which, by the terms of the Union, is established in North Britain, it would give us no offence to use that form of worship which, by the same terms, is established in South Britain. But we find it far more wise . . . for although all sectaries are undisturbed in their way, throughout this and your other dominions, yet no man does any one own himself a son of the church of England, but forthwith the cry is raised against him, and he is charged with the most horrid innovations that ever crept into the church of God.” It is probable that this petition reached her majesty, for it produced no beneficial effect.

1711.—THE DECISION of the House of Lords in the case of Mr. Greenshields excited the utmost indignation of the dissenting ministers; but it convinced them that they would not be allowed to ride roughshod over the prostrate church, by the English parliament. It was fiercely denounced as a breach of the articles of Union—a direct violation of the principles of the Revolution—tended to shake the throne of queen Anne, and to produce a counter-revolution. It was considered as the effect of prelatic influence in the legislation and councils of the sovereign; and the Assembly, at its meeting in May, drew up a formula of questions for probation on the admission of ministers, much more stringent than had been in use before. “ Aware of the coming danger apprehended from the unprincipled statesmen who now fill the councils of the nation, the General Assembly gave specific directions to the commission to do what might be necessary for the preservation of the rights and privileges of the church, and empowered them to send a commission to London to see cause, to watch over the progress of events, and to seek the redress of grievances¹.” This Assembly, however, is chiefly remarkable for its recognition of the protestant succession in the house of Hanover. An act was passed unanimously recommending the ministers to pray for queen

¹ Hetherington’s History, 196.

princess Sophia, and the protestant line in that family, in whom the succession to the crown of these dominions is law established¹.

[THE JACOBITES thought the late change of ministry a favorable opportunity both to shew their own inclinations and try the fidelity of their friends. Upon this presumption, the duchess of Gordon, a Roman catholic, sent Mr. Robert Met, then dean of faculty of the advocates at Edinburgh, a present of a silver medal, with the head of the exiled king on the right side, and the legend CUJUS EST, and on the reverse the British islands, with the motto REDDITE. The dean was shy of receiving this medal on his own responsibility, but he summoned a meeting, and presented it to the faculty, telling them “her grace the duchess of Gordon sent, as a present to them, a medal of king James VIII., whom the French and the English called the pretender; and he hoped the medals would be returned to her grace.” It was moved to refuse the medal to her grace; because its reception was owning the contrary to her majesty’s possession. It was also moved, that it was time enough to receive the medal when the prelate was hanged: when Mr. Dundass, of Arniston, rose and said,—“Whatever these gentlemen may say of their loyalty, I think they affront the queen whom they pretend to honour, by disgracing her brother, who is not only a prince of the blood, but the first thereof; and if blood can give any right, she is our *undoubted sovereign*. I think, too, they call her majesty’s title in question, which is not our business to determine. Medals are the documents of history, to which all historians refer, and therefore, although I should give king William’s stamp with the devil at his right ear, I see not how it could be refused, seeing an hundred years hence it would prove as good a coin had been in England. But what needs further speeches? None oppose the receiving the medal, and return thanks to her grace, but a few pitiful scoundrel vermin and brooms, not worthy our notice. Let us, therefore, propose to name some of our number to return our hearty thanks to the duchess of Gordon.” A vote of thanks was then carried by a majority of sixty-three votes against twelve. Mr. Dundass returned her the most hearty thanks of the faculty [that the bar of Scotland] for all favours; particularly in presenting them with a medal of their sovereign lord the king, and being confident that her grace should very soon have an opportunity to compliment the faculty with a second

¹ Acts of Assembly, 450.

medal, struck upon the restoration of the king and royal family, and the finishing of rebellion, usurpation, tyranny, and whiggery¹." This was supposed to have been done to counteract the declaration of the kirk in favour of the Hanoverian succession. The ambassador from the elector of Hanover presented a memorial to the government, and urged the prosecution of Mr. Dundass. His request was not only granted, but sir David Dalrymple, the advocate, was dismissed for not having prosecuted the medalists, and sir James Stuart was restored to the office of lord advocate.

FOUR BISHOPS had been consecrated, in pursuance of the uncatholic scheme which had been introduced into the church of Scotland by bishop Rose, of a "college of bishops," who were to act in common, without any of them being appointed to the charge of a particular district. Bishop Sage was the first of these, and he assumed no jurisdiction over any body of presbyters, but only assisted the bishops who had been consecrated before the Revolution, who seem to have thought that as the government had been legally committed to them, they ought exclusively to retain it during their lives. The college bishops were all, however, canonically consecrated, and invested with full powers for conveying to others the same grace which they had themselves received by imposition of hands, for the purpose, as was expressed in the deed of consecration, of preserving, through that dangerous and distressful period, a regular episcopal succession in the church². Bishop Sage had long been afflicted with the complaint familiarly known as Consumption, which caused his death in June this year. He was seized at Kinross, in the year 1706, with a numbness in his legs, and an atrophy, which confined him to his bed nearly a year. On his recovery, he was advised to go to Bath for the benefit of the water; but from which he derived little benefit. He went to London in 1709, where his reputation had preceded him, and he formed friendships with Dr. Lloyd, late bishop of Norwich, Dr. Hicke, Dr. Leslie, Mr. Wagstaffe, Mr. Collyer, Mr. Elliot, Dr. Cave, Dr. Smalridge, and many other of the learned and eminent men of that age. He corresponded with Mr. Dodwell; but though he admired his incomparable learning, his primitive piety, and his profound knowledge, "yet he most passionately regretted the extravagant and unwary position advanced by that great author in most of his later pieces."

¹ Boyer's History of Queen Anne, 512.—Scottish Episcopal Mag. ii. 431.

² Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated, 387-389.

He wrote, but never published, a tract against Mr. Dodwell's "Natural Mortality of the Soul." He was much importuned to remain in London; but being sensible of the gradual decay of nature, and feeling that irrepressible desire with which consumptive patients are generally seized previous to their dissolution, of visiting the scenes of their nativity, and "having a great longing to see his own country and to die there," he declined their kind entreaties. He returned home, therefore, still sickly and weak in body, but with as strong and lively a vigour of mind as ever. He immediately entered into literary pursuits, and projected, among other things, the publication of "An impartial and accurate Survey of the Westminster Confession of Faith," which it is most deeply to be lamented that he did not live to execute. He also intended to have employed his "accurate and learned pen on the Rise and History of the *Commission* of the General Assembly . . . An impartial and distinct account of that pretended ecclesiastical court, such as we might have expected from that excellent man, would have tended very much to the advantage and interest of this afflicted church; seeing it is plain that the commission of Assembly, though a judicatory founded on *no law, and never established by any act of parliament*, has done far more hurt and injustice than ever the assemblies themselves were able to do¹."

FOR SOME weeks previous to his death he became so weak that he could not apply himself closely to any business, not even to write familiar letters, without pain; notwithstanding, he still retained the same cheerfulness, and his conversation was as lively as formerly. The night before his death, when a friend was condoling with him on his present afflicted condition, he said, "Ye need not be troubled about me, I am as free from all uneasiness as yourself is. I thank God I have neither pain of body nor trouble of mind; though, at the same time, I am very sensible that I am posting to eternity, but not after the ordinary manner of postmen, who ride fast the first day, and slower before they come to the end of their journey; but I post twice as swiftly this day as I did the former." With the same lassitude of body and tranquillity of mind, he died at Edinburgh on June the 7th, having retained his senses to the very last minute of his life. He departed this life in the fear of God, in the unity of the church, and in peace with all the world, on the very same day that

¹ Bishop Gillon's Life of Bishop Sage, 1714, 31, 35, 67.

his learned friend, Mr. Dodwell, died. His death was most sincerely lamented by all good and learned men, and it was the greatest loss to that church that could have occurred. His constant friend, the lord bishop of Edinburgh, performed the last duties to him, and he was honourably interred in the Grey Friars' churchyard. He was a man of excellent parts and endowments, and he was well versed in pure and primitive antiquity. "His excellent and elaborate writings are sufficient, and will be an eternal monument of his vast genius, sharp wit, and solid judgment. His piety was sincere and unaffected, without the least mixture either of melancholy, peevishness, enthusiasm, or superstition. The whole conduct of his life was truly christian and prudent, and his conversation was just, instructive, and pleasant. . . . He suited his discourses to the meanest capacities. He defended the church strenuously and learnedly with his pen, in its low condition and was fit to have governed it in its highest post, if it had pleased God to restore it to peace and tranquillity. In short, he was one of the most learned and wisest men of his time, worthy to be remembered, honoured, and imitated by all good men¹."

IN CONSEQUENCE of bishop Sage's death, the bishop of Edinburgh thought it again necessary to make an addition to the episcopal college; and with the concurrence of his brethren he selected the honourable and reverend Archibald Campbell, "a presbyter of the church of Scotland, then living in London²," to be added to the episcopal college. Although he had been long in priests' orders, yet he had never had fixed charge, but was highly recommended for his learning and other valuable accomplishments. By some means he had got possession of the original registers of the General Assembly produced by Johnston, of Warriston, in the rebellious assembly of 1638, and in the year 1737 he made a gift of them to Sion College for preservation. These records were borrowed by the House of Commons, and the librarian holds the speaker Mr. Manners Sutton's receipt for them; and they were burnt in the great fire which destroyed the two houses of parliament. He was the son of lord Neil Campbell, who was the second son of Archibald, marquis of Argyle, the DICTATOR, that was executed for high treason at the Restoration. He was consecrated on August the 24th, at Dundee, by bishop Rose o

¹ Gillon's Life of Bishop Sage, 67-69.

² MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.

Edinburgh, the metropolitan; bishop Douglass, of Dunblane, and bishop Falconar, one of the college of bishops, without a particular diocese¹.

NOTWITHSTANDING their boast of the favour and inclination of the people, the General Assembly found the greatest possible difficulty in overcoming the affection of the people in the north for episcopacy, and in "planting the churches." Wodrow says, that their agents met with "very inhuman treatment in some places, from those that are disaffected to the present establishment." A number of representations were sent up from the northern parts to the Assembly, "and particularly one from Rosshire:—Mr. John Morison, minister of Gerloch, who, in April last, was transported to that place (a parish of thirty miles in length), and when going to preach in ——— was met on the confines by a company of armed men belonging to sir John M'Kenzie, of Cowl, who forcibly carried Mr. Morison off, and put him in a cottage with cattle, and kept him with a guard two days, without meat or drink, or bed, or any thing, and the third allowed him a little meat, but kept him still prisoner in that same place, without bed, or any accommodation; and when the fifth day came he was carried to Cowl's house, who owned to him that no presbyterian should be placed in any place where he had influence or interest, unless the queen's forces did it by the strong hand. He was told that they looked on presbytery as dying, and would keep all the parishes they could vacant for their own ministers²." This opposition to the "plantation of kirks" was very common over all the country north of the Tay; but Wodrow exercises his old tricks of misrepresenting and exaggerating the faults of his political enemies. He relates another instance of popular opposition to the settlement of a minister at Old Deer, in Aberdeenshire, where the presbytery met at the kirk to ordain and induct a Mr. Gordon, a son of the provost of Aberdeen:—"When a justice of peace was making patent doors in a strait pass, where the presbytery and about forty from Aberdeen were waiting to get in, the people threw down *great big* stones from the [the editor says roofs] and out of the houses, which did oblige the Aberdeens-men to fire two guns, which dissipated the rabble, wounded some of them, but not dangerously. Unless there had been a seasonable interposition there would have been bloody work; but

¹ Keith's Catalogue, 530.—Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 608.—Perceval's Apology, 253.—List affixed to the Address of the Episcopal Clergy of Connecticut, 38.—Primitive Truth and Order, 520.

² Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 216.

the presbytery retired. The business is like to be accorde, and taken up¹." The case was brought before the court of session, and the lord justice Clerk persuaded the heritors to receive Mr. Gordon peaceably, and to pay the expenses of the process; and ordained some of the principal rioters to stand before the congregation, and to give security for the others; so that the affair, after all, seems to have been exaggerated².

1712.—WE ARE informed, by an anti-patronage author, "the year 1712 must ever be regarded as a *black* year in the annals of the church of Scotland³." Its blackness consists in the tardy resolution of the queen and the British parliament to protect the Scottish episcopalians from the presbyterian persecution, which was carried on without intermission. Greenshields' persecution and appeal had made their disaffection known, and had created such a sensation at London, that it excited the compassion of the lovers of the church and many of the members of both houses. They saw, says bishop Russell, "a clergyman thrown into prison, where he was confined twelve months, for no other crime than that of performing divine service to certain natives of England according to the form of their own church; and they learned that this act of unreasonable severity was justified by a reference to the article of Union between the two kingdoms, which secured to the church her own discipline and worship⁴."

A MOTION was made in the House of Commons, on Jan. 21st, for reading the act of the first Scottish parliament of William III., which was passed on the 29th of June, 1695, entitled "An Act against irregular Baptisms and Marriages." The same was read accordingly; after which a bill was ordered to be brought in "to preserve the liturgy of the church of Scotland," and for repealing the act passed in the parliament of Scotland, entitled "An Act against irregular Baptisms and Marriages." This bill was brought in, and read twice; on the 29th of January a clause was ordered to be added to it, "to oblige all persons who should take the benefit of the act, to pray for her majesty, the princess Sophia, and the rest of the royal family; and that all other preachers and teachers in Scotland be obliged to do the same." Hetherington calls this an unmasking of those batteries with which they hoped to lay prostrate the [presbyterian] church of Scotland; he pretends to say, that "the Scottish parliament had s

¹ Wodrow's Correspondence, 218.

² Ibid. 226.

³ Hetherington's History, 196.

⁴ History of the Church in Scotland, ii. 395.

jected the episcopalians to the jurisdiction and discipline of the presbyterian church courts, and forbidding the civil sanction to be added to ecclesiastical sentences for their enforcement¹." As soon as it was known that this bill was before parliament, the commission immediately met, and despatched principal Carstares, with Blackwell (professor of divinity at Aberdeen), and Baillie (minister of Inverness), to London, post, with instructions to use every exertion in their power to prevent the bill from passing. They carried along with them a petition from the commission to the House of Commons, praying that the said bill might not pass into a law; but a motion having been made, and the question put, that the said petition be brought up, it passed in the negative. A motion was then made, and the question put, that it be an instruction to the committee that they receive a clause to oblige all persons in Scotland, who have any office, civil or military, or any salary or place of profit under the crown, to attend divine service according to the law of Scotland, and to *restrain* them from going to episcopal meetings. This clause was also negatived. The house resolved itself into a committee of the whole house, and having made some progress, the house adjourned till the 31st of January. "The repeal of the rigorous act against their baptisms was a great relief to their minds, as it freed them from the daily risk of imprisonment or banishment in the execution of a part of their office which they could not dispense with, and only exposed them to a pecuniary mulct when added to their other delinquencies. Yet, though thus, by the good nature of the queen and the mildness of the administration, which generally follows the inclinations of the sovereign, they were in some measure relieved from the outward pressure of the former reign, they were still exposed to many difficulties in the course of their internal management, which required all the prudence they were masters of to enable them to act both a conscientious and an inoffensive part²."

ALTHOUGH the intolerance of the kirk had received a check by the rejection of their petition in the Commons, yet their bigotry remained the same. The commission sent up an address to the queen to Carstares, wherein, among other things, they represented to her majesty, "that the fifth act of parliament, 1690, which allows the presbyterian ministers and elders to have power to try and purge out all insufficient, negligent, scandalous, and erroneous ministers, by due course of

¹ History, 196.

² Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 612.

ecclesiastical process and censures, and likewise to redress all other church disorders; and added, by which act it is evident that presbyterian church government being thus established the ministers and elders of this church have *all the power* committed by our Lord and Master to his ministers and officers to watch over the flock, and to guard against all usurpers and intruders. That the sixth act of parliament 1707, 'for securing the protestant religion and presbyterian government,' whereby all the other acts in favour of the same are ratified and approved, 'is declared to be an essential and fundamental condition of the Treaty of Union, without any alteration thereof, or derogation thereto, in any sort, for ever, even beyond the reach of parliament.' . . . That episcopal dissenters shall have liberty to meet and assemble for the exercise of divine worship, in their own manner, and to use in their congregations the Liturgy of the church of England, without any disturbance; and that no person or persons shall incur any penalty whatsoever upon account of his or their resorting to the said episcopal meeting: and that it shall be free and lawful for all the subjects in that part of Great Britain called Scotland to assemble and meet for divine service, without any disturbance, and to settle their congregations where they think fit: And for the episcopal ministers not only to pray and preach in these congregations, but to administer the sacraments, and marry, without incurring any pain or penalty whatsoever, without any other caveat that appears for their doctrine, save that they shall not deny, in their preaching or writing, the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity and withal, that the presbyterian clergy are still allowed to inflict ecclesiastical censures upon those of their own communion; which plainly imports an exemption of all who shall disown their communion: they cannot but express their astonishing surprise and deep affliction to hear of such a bill offered for such a large and almost boundless toleration, not only threatening the overthrow of their church, but giving a large license almost to *all errors and blasphemies*, and throwing up all good discipline, to the dishonour of God, and the scandal and ruin of the true christian religion, and the infallible disturbance of the quiet, and to the confusion of the church and nation: And therefore, with all humility, but with the greatest earnestness, they did beseech, nay, obtest her majesty, by the same mercy of God that restored that church, and raised her majesty to the throne, to interpose for the relief of that church, and the maintenance of the present establish-

ment, against such a manifest and ruining encroachment, in such manner as in her royal wisdom and justice she should think needful ¹."

AT THE DELIVERING of this address Carstares made a short speech to the same effect, and received a very gracious answer from her majesty, with further assurances of her royal protection of the establishment². Here was a most gross insult offered to the sovereign and to the church of England, mingled with the most unchristian intolerance and bigotry. They told the queen, to her face, that the Liturgy, by which she daily approached the throne of grace, was full of "all errors and *blasphemies*!" and that it was "dishonourable to God, and scandalous to men!" We have the evidence of a work compiled a short time before, that the presbyterian worship was replete with blasphemous expressions, "enthusiastic zeal, farce, and nonsense³;" an evil that can hardly be avoided, when every pretender to the Spirit was allowed to be "the mouth of the congregation," and to say whatsoever his own opinions prompted. But the reason which they assign for their intolerance is a noble tribute of praise to that chastised and sober compilation of the whole will of God, as made known to us in Scripture, contained in the Book of Common Prayer.

THE TOLERATION BILL in favour of episcopacy was read the third time in the Commons on the 7th of February, upon which occasion sir David Dalrymple said,—"That since he saw the house was resolved to make no alterations in the body of the bill, he acquiesced, and only desired that the title of it might be, "A Bill for establishing Jacobitism and *Immorality* in Scotland." After this, a motion was made that the bill do pass *nemine contradicente*. Another Scottish member opposed it, saying, "he hoped many of his countrymen, and indeed all good patriots, would be against a bill which was diametrically opposite to the Treaty of Union, since it repealed an act which was an unalterable part of that treaty." But the question having been put, it was carried in the affirmative by a majority of 162 votes, of which 149 were English, and 13 Scotch, against 17, whereof 14 were Scotch and 3 English; whereupon sir Simon Stuart was ordered to carry it to the Lords⁴.

¹ Acts of Assembly, 467-469—Willison's Testimony, 37.

² Boyer's History of Queen Anne, 541, 542—Salmon's Chronological Historian, ii. 15.

³ Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed, *passim*.

⁴ Boyer's History, 541.

BUT THE commission of the kirk carried their opposition to the toleration of episcopacy to the bar of the House of Lords. Their intolerance ought not to create any surprise, however much it may excite disgust, because it is only a development of their vow to *extirpate* the church¹. Before proceeding to the second reading of the Toleration Bill, on the 13th of February, the House of Peers heard counsel in behalf of the presbyterians who opposed the bill. Their counsel alleged, in general, "that this bill annulling an act ratified by the Act of Union, the same might be attended with very fatal consequences; and then made particular objections to the bill itself, as that it seemed to grant toleration to all episcopal clergymen, under colour whereof popish priests might pretend to perform the Romish service in Scotland." Their arguments, however, were ineffectual in stopping the progress of the bill, but they prevailed so far as to procure the addition of the oath of abjuration, for the purpose of preventing the said papists and jacobites from obtaining any advantage by this act. The bill was read a second time, and remitted to a committee of the whole house the same day. Lord Halifax and Gilbert Burnet (bishop of Salisbury) endeavoured to show the inconvenience and danger of such a bill, especially at such a juncture. The first, among other things, said,—“That he hoped that illustrious Assembly would never follow the example of a neighbouring prince, in making use of the distinction between the spirit and the letter of a treaty, for in the present case such an evasion would not do, since this bill was diametrically opposite to the treaty of Union.” After some other lords had spoken both for and against the bill, it was resolved to add several clauses to it: one particularly for “limiting the toleration to such ministers as had received holy orders from the hands of a protestant bishop, and who had taken and subscribed the oaths of allegiance and abjuration;” as also “for obliging the ministers of the established church of Scotland to take and subscribe the said oaths.” On the 15th these amendments were reported, and agreed to by the House of Lords, and the next day the bill was sent down to the Commons, who took the amendments into their consideration, and agreed to them on the 21st, with a small amendment of their own, to which the Lords agreed on the 26th. The royal assent was given on the 3d of March to this measure.

¹ Burnet's Own Times, vi. 106, 107—Lockhart's Papers; Commentaries pp. 378-381.

important act, which has secured the peaceable enjoyment to members of the reformed catholic church of Scotland of praying both with the spirit and with the understanding¹.

“IT WERE A PITY to forget,” says Lockhart, “that Mr. Carstares and his brethren did present to the House of Lords a petition against the Toleration Bill, printed copies whereof were, by them and their friends, handed about, and delivered to the several lords; which petition, though contrary to their known principles and tender consciences on other occasions, was addressed to the lords *spiritual* and temporal. But when they came to Scotland, and were challenged by some of the most zealous of their party how they came to acknowledge and shew so much respect to the English prelates by addressing them under the title of *lords spiritual*, they had no defence but by denying the fact, until some people produced copies of the petition in terms mentioned².” The following is an abridgment of this act:—

AN ACT to prevent the disturbing those of the episcopal communion in that part of Great Britain called Scotland in the exercise of their religious worship, and in the use of the Liturgy of the Church of England; and for repealing the act passed in the parliament of Scotland, intituled an Act against irregular Baptisms and Marriages. WHEREAS, since the abolishing of the episcopal government in Scotland, those of the episcopal persuasion there have been *frequently disturbed and interrupted in their religious assemblies*, and their *ministers prosecuted* for reading the English service in their congregations, and for administering the sacraments according to the form and manner prescribed in the Liturgy of the church of England:—Be it therefore enacted, &c. that *it shall be free and lawful* for all those of the episcopal communion in that part of Great Britain called Scotland, to meet and assemble for divine worship, to be performed after their own manner by pastors ordained by a protestant bishop, and who are not established ministers of any church or parish, and to use in their congregations the Liturgy of the church of England, if they think fit, without let, hindrance, or disturbance from any person whatsoever; and all sheriffs of shires, stewards of stewartries, and magistrates of boroughs, and justices of the peace, are hereby strictly required to give all manner of protection,

¹ Boyer's History of Queen Anne, 547, 548—Salmon's Chronological Historian, ii. 16.

² Lockhart's Memoirs, i. 383, 384.

aid, and assistance to such episcopal ministers, and those of their own communion, in their meetings and assemblies for the worship of God, held in any town or place, except parish churches, within the extent and jurisdiction of that part of Great Britain called Scotland.—II. Provided always, That none shall presume to exercise the function of a pastor in the said episcopal meetings and congregations, except such as shall have received holy orders from the hands of a protestant bishop; and that the said letters of orders be entered on record by the registrar or clerk of the meeting of the justices.—III. All ministers of the established church of Scotland, and all and every person or persons who is or are pastor or pastors, minister or ministers, of any episcopal congregation in Scotland, shall be obliged to take the oaths of allegiance and abjuration.—IV. Provided always, That the assembly of persons for religious worship in the episcopal meetings be held with doors not locked, barred, or bolted during such assembly; and that nothing herein contained shall be construed to exempt any of the persons frequenting any of the said episcopal congregations from paying tithes or other parochial duties to the church or minister of the parish to which they belong, and in which they reside.

V. AND WHEREAS, since the establishment of presbyterian government in Scotland, some laws have been made by the parliament of Scotland against the episcopal clergy of that part of the United Kingdom, and particularly the act of 1695, entituled, *Act against irregular Baptisms and Marriages*, by which all episcopal ministers who were *turned out* of their churches are prohibited to baptize any children, or to solemnize any marriage, upon pain of *perpetual imprisonment or banishment*: be it therefore enacted, &c. that the aforesaid act is repealed and annulled: and that in all time coming no person shall incur any disability, forfeiture, or penalty whatsoever, and that it shall be free and lawful to assemble and meet together and to settle their congregations in *what towns or parishes they shall think fit to choose*, except parish churches. VI. Provided always, that the parents who have their children christened by an episcopal minister, be hereby obliged to enter the birth and christening of their children in the register books belonging to their respective parishes. And that no episcopal minister presume to marry any persons, but those whose banns have been duly published three several Lord's days in the episcopal congregations, and in the parish churches where the parties reside: and the ministers of parish churches are hereby obliged to publish the said banns. VII. Provides that

all laws against immorality shall be in force. VIII. Provides that this act shall not give any ease to popish recusants, or to those who deny the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. IX. Provides that those who disturb any episcopal congregation, or any magistrate who hinders such meetings, shall forfeit £100; one moiety to the informer, the other to the poor of the parish. X. Provides that no civil pain or forfeiture, or disability whatsoever, shall be in any ways incurred by any person, by reason of any excommunication or persecution in order to excommunication, by the [established] church judicatories in Scotland; and all civil magistrates are hereby expressly prohibited and discharged to force and compel any person to appear when summoned, or to give obedience to any such sentence when pronounced. XI. Provides that all ministers shall pray for queen Anne by name, under a penalty of £20. XII. Provided always, that no minister or preacher offending herein shall suffer any penalties unless he be prosecuted for the same within the space of two months after the offence was committed¹."

THIS ACT gave the church a little rest during the residue of queen Anne's life; and was, in fact, a re-establishment of it, only without the endowments. It was gall and wormwood to the presbyterians, who dreaded nothing more than the prevalence of sobriety and truth in the public worship of the church, lest their own people might see its beauty. Dr. M'Crie complains that the "national guilt was increased by the terms in which the incorporating union was settled . . . the maintenance of the hierarchy and ceremonies in England being declared a fundamental and essential article of it . . . the nation . . . virtually renounced that sacred league and oath, which it was previously under, to endeavour the reformation of religion in England²." Mr. Willison laments "that all episcopal ministers were allowed to preach, pray, administer the sacraments, and marry, without any other caveat that appears for their doctrine, save that they shall not deny the doctrine of the blessed Trinity. They are not by that act obliged to satisfy the [presbyterian] church . . . so that there is a liberty given to the most erroneous or scandalous men to preach and dispense sacraments without being accountable to any³."

BISHOP CAMPBELL resided in London, holding communion

¹ Statutes at Large.

² Testimony of the Associate Synod of Orig. Seceders, 40.

³ Ibid. 38.

with the non-juring bishops, that had been deprived at Revolution, and their successors. He was of great service to the Scottish church, particularly in making known the distressed state of his brethren in Scotland, and in projecting a collection, to be afterwards noticed, for their pecuniary relief, which he constantly promoted by his influence and active exertions in England. He assisted at this time at the consecration of a Scottish bishop in London; a singular circumstance but which may be easily accounted for. Dr. James Gadderar was one of those unhappy men that were rabbled in such a barbarous manner out of his church and parish of Kilmaurs in-Cunningham, in the county of Ayr, and the diocese of Glasgow. The pecuniary distress to which the rabbled clergy were reduced, induced Mr. Gadderar to settle in London, where he had resided several years, and officiated as a clergyman among the non-jurors. He was pitched upon by the church at home to be "numbered" with the bishops of the suffering church. The exigencies of the church required bishop Falconar's presence in London, and he carried up the consecration of the church for this consecration, and also the "express desire" of bishop Rose, the metropolitan. Mr. Skinner says, Dr. Gadderar "has left such a precious memory behind him in our church, especially in the diocese of Aberdeen¹," that he thought unnecessary to write any character of him, as it dwelt by tradition in the hearts of the faithful. Mr. Cheyne speaks of his integrity as "stern and fearless," and that he "was equally well known to be earnest for the revival of those primitive doctrines which the influence of a puritanical theology altogether thrust out, or too much obscured²." The consecration took place in London, on February the 14th, being Matthias' day, by bishop George Hicke, assisted by bishop John Falconar and bishop Archibald Campbell³. "It need be no surprise," says Mr. Skinner, "to find a consecration in Scotland performed at London, and in part by English hands. Bishop Campbell had his ordinary residence in London, where Gadderar also lived for some years: and bishop Falconar, being at London, may well enough be accounted for from the exigencies of the church, which not only called for a brotherly correspondence, but even many times required personal interviews, and led up of our bishops and clergy now and then to London to assist in the common cause. However, this

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 608-9.

² The Authority and Use of the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated, 2d

³ List of the Consecrations and Succession of Scots Bishops, 38.—Appendix to Primitive Truths and Order, 520.—Perceval's Apology, 2d Ed. 253.

secration of bishop Gadderar, though seemingly out of the usual course, yet having been not only with bishop Rose's consent, but likewise at his express desire, was approved of by all his Scottish brethren¹."

THE TOLERATION had no sooner received the royal authority, than, upon a motion made in the House of Commons, on the 13th of March, a bill was brought in "to restore the patrons to their ancient rights of presenting ministers to the churches vacant in that part of Great Britain called Scotland." Sir David Dalrymple published a pamphlet, giving "An account of lay patronages in Scotland, and of the fatal consequences they have occasioned between the church and lay-patrons; with observations on the arguments for restoring them." Notwithstanding the reasons which sir David produced, the majority of the Commons were determined to proceed with the bill. And to shew still more favour to the reformed catholic church in Scotland, Mr. Carnegie introduced a bill on the 17th of March for repealing an act of the Scottish parliament, entituled, "An Act for discharging the Yule vacance;" that is, for restoring the observation of Christmas holidays in the courts of law, and other offices. It was received, and read a first time on that day². As soon as this was known at Edinburgh, the commission of the kirk met, drew up and transmitted a remonstrance to parliament, in which they say—"That the act, 1690, abolishing patronages, is a part of our presbyterian *constitution*, ratified by the acts of parliament of both kingdoms in the treaty of union, and declared to be unalterable. That from our first reformation from popery, patronages have still been reckoned a yoke and burthen upon this church; and this is declared by the First and Second Books of Discipline: that the restoring of them will inevitably obstruct the work of the gospel, and create great disorders and disquiet in this church and nation; and that there is one known abuse attending patronages, viz. the laying a foundation for simoniacal pactions betwixt patrons and those presented by them³." These reasons, however, were ineffectual. The bill for restoring patrons to their ancient rights in Scotland, was read a third time on the 7th of April, and sent up to the lords. The agents for the kirk laid the above representation before their lordships; but though some of the peers were apprehensive of fatal consequences, yet the majority were of another opinion, and the bill was

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 609.

² Boyer's History of Queen Anne, 549.

³ Acts of Assembly, session 470, 471.—Willison's Testimony, 39.

went back on the 14th with an amendment, to which the Commons readily agreed. And Burnet says, "the bill passed through both houses, a small opposition being only made in either¹." Dr. McCrie says that this act was made out of a "principle of hostility to the presbyterian church . . . and has done perhaps more injury to the interests of religion in Scotland than any other measure²."

ON THE 31st of May, on a motion made by Mr. Murray one of the members for Scotland, the House of Commons resolved to address the queen, "That she would be pleased to apply the rents of the late bishops' lands in North Britain, that remained in the crown, for the support of such of the episcopal clergy there, as should take the oaths to her majesty." Mr. secretary St. John reported to the house on the 16th of June, that their address, relating to the rents of the bishops' lands in North Britain, which remain in the crown, having been presented to her majesty, she had commanded him to acquaint the house, that the profits of those lands should be applied to the support of such of the episcopal clergy there as should take the oaths according to the desire of the house. The presbyterians were not a little startled at the momentary gleam of prosperity that now attended the church; and Burnet says, "By these steps the presbyterians were alarmed, when they saw the success of every motion that was made on design to weaken and undermine their establishment³." By these acts, the reformed catholic church was placed in a much better position than she had enjoyed at any time since the Revolution; and the charitable authors of them ought ever to be mentioned with the greatest respect; but as far as I have been able to ascertain, queen Anne's commands respecting the church property were never carried into effect.

The author of the MS. already cited, says, "About this time, the liturgy of the church of England was almost universally revived and introduced in all the episcopal congregations in Scotland; nay, in some parochial churches, viz. Cuthen and St. Fergus, where the earls of Erroll and Marischal had the greatest sway, who by their interest, had two episcopal clergymen serving their cures viz. Messieurs WILLIAM DUNN and Alexander Herdorn⁴." Meeting-houses were set up in several towns and villages where both pastors and people maintained the ground firm against embracing the English

¹ John Burnet to the House of Commons 1685.

² Testimony, p. 41.

³ Burnet's History, i. c. 2. *Testimony*, p. 41. *Our Times*, vi. 100.

⁴ *Testimony*, p. 41. *Our Times*, vi. 100.

liturgy, and it was brought into several parish churches. Church principles and communion, and the sinfulness and danger of schism, began now to be better understood by the generality of people; even such as had little notion of it before. All this was in a great measure owing to the generous charity of many pious and well-disposed persons, of all ranks of the Church of England, particularly of the famous University of Oxford, at whose charges and charitable contributions, without any brief to further it, above 19,000 Common Prayer Books, and other devotional and edifying books relating to it, were emitted from London in the space of two years. This great and generous charity had its designed effect, by making many sincere proselytes to the liturgy, of all ranks and degrees of people. This, to be sure, was a great eye-sore to the presbyterians. It grieved them at the heart, and heightened their rage and fury to a great degree, to see the English mass, as they called it, universally spreading and cheerfully received even in Glasgow itself, without any law to enforce it, but that of its native beauty, purity, and simplicity, so agreeable to the gospel-spirit, and adapted to all capacities, and so wonderfully contrived to excite devotion. But what could they do? The court and parliament had declared for it, and it was not to be suppressed by open force. They sought to run it down by calumny and slander, and called it, in their pulpits, popish, superstitious, and idolatrous. They said the Scots episcopacy was tolerable in comparison of it; they failed not to alarm the people with dreadful prospects of what might follow, and talked pretty plainly of the reasonableness and expediency of *taking up arms*, if matters continued to go on at this rate. And the event has made it too plain; they thirsted for a favourable opportunity to give the finishing stroke, both to episcopacy and to the use of the liturgy in Scotland, which they reckoned as given them in 1715-16¹."

ON THE 12th of April this year, the princess Louisa Maria Teresa, youngest daughter of the late king James, died of the small-pox, at St. Germain's, to the regret of many in England, even of those who were unfriendly to her brother's claims. She received a very high character from those who had an opportunity of appreciating it, and was a princess justly esteemed for her wit, piety, and all those qualities worthy of her high birth. Lord Dartmouth says—"The queen [Anne] shewed me a letter wrote in the king of France's own hand, upon the death of her sister; in which there was the highest character that ever

¹ Representation of the State of the Church in North Britain, 11-20.

was given to any princess of her age. Mr. Richard Hill came straight from the earl of Godolphin's . . . to me with the news, and said it was the worst that ever came to England. I asked him why he thought so. He said it had been happy if it had been her brother; for then the queen might have sent for her, and married her to prince George, who could have no pretensions during her own life; which would have pleased every honest man in the kingdom, and made an end of all disputes for the future." Madame Maintenon thus speaks of her after her decease, which was at the age of twenty—"I had the honour of passing two hours with the queen of England, who is the very image of desolation. The princess had become her friend and only consolation," She was buried at St. Germain¹.

ON THE 12th of July, Richard Cromwell died, in the 90th year of his age, and was buried at Cheshunt. He succeeded his father as Protector on the 3d of September, 1658. In April, 1659, he was persuaded by the council of officers to dissolve the parliament, with which his authority ended, and from that minute nobody resorted to him, nor was the name of the Protector heard of but in derision. Thus, says lord Clarendon, "by extreme pusillanimity, the son suffered himself to be stripped in one moment of all the greatness and power which the father had acquired in so many years, with wonderful courage, industry, and resolution."

IN CONSEQUENCE of the barbarities, some of which have already been detailed, that the reformed catholic clergy of Scotland suffered, they that had been rabbled were reduced to the last extremity of distress, even to a state of starvation. Some of them were obliged to leave their ungrateful country, and seek daily bread in England, and other countries; and those who remained were poorly supported by the precarious charity of the well disposed. Many were obliged to apply themselves to mean secular employments, when the repeated persecutions of the kirk prevented them from exercising their sacred functions, even in private houses and in their own families. Six hundred pounds per annum of the bishops' rents were given for a number of years to the agents of the kirk to defray the expense of persecuting the clergy! This marks the double sacrilege of which the kirk and the queen's ministers were guilty—of diverting what her majesty piously restored to God, to persecute HIM. There was no fund to

¹ The editor's Note to Burnet's Own Times, vi. 120.—Salmon's Chronological Historian, ii. 18.

supply the persecuted clergy with the means of defending their own causes in the courts of law ; but they were imprisoned, fined, and harassed without mercy, solely for the guilt of adhering to episcopacy. Under these circumstances, and to preserve many of them and their families from dying of starvation, they applied to their brethren in the church of England, through the medium of bishop Campbell, for a seasonable relief in their extremity. As soon as their dreadful situation was known in England, subscriptions were liberally made for their assistance ; but the malice of their persecutors operated even here. De Foe, and one Tutchin, who conducted two periodicals, *The Review* and *The Observer*, made every exertion, by misrepresenting their case, to prevent the collections from proceeding. Leslie says that this collection “has enraged and provoked the spirit of presbytery, lest they should be disappointed of their beloved expectation, to see those *starve* before their eyes whom they have reduced to that miserable condition. And now all pains is taken, and this *Observer* is employed to put forth his whole strength and rhetoric to stop these collections which are going about for the distressed Scots clergy, and to prejudice every one all that he can against contributing any thing for their relief¹.” It is but fair, however, to say that De Foe, editor of the *Review*, afterwards repented, and gave a guinea in aid of this collection. One of the objections that they made to relieving the distress of the clergy was, that they had refused to take the oaths to William and Mary ; but it was impossible to have taken the oaths to them *before* they were made king and queen. There were upwards of three hundred of the clergy rabbled out of their livings before the middle of January, 1689, and who were never restored to them ; whereas the prince and princess of Orange were not recognised as king and queen till the 11th of April. Taking the oaths to them, therefore, had nothing at all to do with the case ; *the real cause* of the persecution was their professing and adhering to episcopacy, for which cause alone they were first rabbled by the mob, and then rejected by the convention, and that, too, before any oaths were imposed. Many died under the operation of rabbling, and others in consequence of it, and some of starvation ; and at this time there were about two hundred families totally destitute, and that depended entirely upon the money collected in England.

THE PRESBYTERIAN ministers found a very serious obstacle in the oath of Abjuration, which the act of Toleration obliged

¹ Rehearsals, iv. 149, 150.

they took the oath to save their stipends, and made use of that trick to favour their design of imposing on the ignorant people, by making them believe that they had not deviated from their principles. For my part, I hate and detest all double dealings, especially in clergymen; they are acceptable neither to God nor man, and can have no effect but to shew that they are as loose in their principles and more mercenary than the worst of their hearers¹."

THE OATH of abjuration, and the explication made by Carstares, created a great sensation, and was another cause of division among the presbyterian ministers, who, it would appear from Wodrow, had even already greatly degenerated from their original principles. In speaking of the English dissenters, he writes to a friend, "I shall not say but the ministers there [in England] have very different views of the literal meaning of the words of the oath of abjuration, from what many of our ministers have; and to be plain with you, I find myself the less straitened with this inconveniency, *that I much doubt, if there be many real presbyterians or ministers now that are heartily upon the foot of Scots presbytery; their principles are very large, and therefore their practice hath little in it difficulting to me*²." The ministers, however, were beginning to find that the government could not now be so easily bullied as they had found that of the Stuarts had been, and Carstares "was willing to *compound* matters with the administration; and upon condition that he was authorised to assure his brethren that no attempts would be made to introduce any alteration in the government or discipline of the church, he undertook to use all his influence in order to allay those ferments which the late proceedings in parliament had occasioned. Accordingly, upon his return to Scotland, we find him exerting his utmost endeavours in calming the spirits of such of the clergy as, from a *misguided zeal*, were disposed *to influence the minds of the people, disturb the peace of the country*, and in the end wreath the yoke with which they were galled still harder about their necks³."

BUT THESE were not the only evils arising out of the abjuration oath; for Wodrow innocently admits what indeed he ought to have known all along, if he had not been judicially blind, *that the jesuits were inflaming their differences*. And his editor, with the same dove-like simplicity that has ever characterised their party, relates the following matter-of-fact-like story:—

¹ A Letter from a Gentleman in Edinburgh to his friend in the Country.

² Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 254, 255.

³ Life of Carstares, p. 83.

"The jacobites are as busy here as possible, and we are informed that there are no less than eighty [popish] priests in the city [of Edinburgh] and the country about. You may depend on the following story *as truth*:—At Peppermills, a village about a mile from town, there was a very grave gentleman went to the house of one Mr. Gillespie, whose wife is a very godly sincere christian, and very sensible. He discoursed to the family and several neighbours there present, concerning religion, *to the admiration of all*. He seemed to be very devout and religious, and mightily concerned and weighed with the sad apostacy and defection the ministers of the poor church of Scotland had now made by taking that woeful and sinful oath, whereby they had openly renounced the covenants and glorious works of reformation, that came swimming to us in the blood of many of our zealous and religious ancestors, and which were miraculously restored to us at our late happy Revolution, by that glorious prince king William, that eminent servant of Jesus Christ. But now the ministers of Scotland, a great many of them, have renounced those great and valuable privileges, and where will godly people get faithful ministers to hear? For my part, said he, I would as soon hear a papist priest as those vile apostates. He went on at this rate for a long time; but Mrs. Gillespie, a wise woman, cried, 'Sirs, this man is a jesuit, grip [seize] him!' Whereupon they offered to lay hold on him, but he got out at the door and escaped. But Mr. Gillespie ordered a servant of his to dodge him, and he went straight to Niddrie, a popish house; and the servant being familiar with one of Niddrie's servants, called for him, and asked him who the gentleman was who came in a short while ago? He answered, *that he was Father Gordon, a priest*. This is a *true story*, and I can give you *MANY OTHERS of the same nature*. So that papists and jesuits are laying all oars in the water to render people disaffected to ministers and to the protestant succession, *and to foment divisions among us*!"

THE PROGRESS that the use of the liturgy at this time was making, excited the utmost alarm in the minds of the presbyterian ministers. Wodrow's correspondence is full of it, and his evidence is invaluable, inasmuch as he presents an authentic tradition of the attachment of both the clergy and the people to that most inestimable compilation of "sound words." In writing to a brother minister near Dundee, he laments the

¹ Wodrow's Correspondence; Editor's Note, i. 341, 342.

fact of the advance of the liturgy most dolorously, and proposes some remedies for counteracting the progress of episcopacy, toleration, and patronage, which he calls corruption and growing evils. He commences with recommending public discussions; but he recollects that there might be considerable damage done to themselves, for he found that it was “noblemen, gentlemen, and people of better rank, who were most inclined to these innovations, and who influence the commonalty.” Then he lets out the secret, that notwithstanding their allegation of the divine origin of presbytery, they were quite *unacquainted* with the episcopal controversy. He says, “I wish we that are called to be watchmen at this juncture, *were more acquainted* with the nature of the *gospel* dispensation and the spirituality of it, and *studied the controversy* betwixt us and our neighbours in England more, than we might be riper in conference and close and solid in our reasonings, as occasion offers. I want not my own fears that many of us *be lame on this point*, which seems to be the present truth in which we ought to be established.” He confesses the “*sufficiency*” of many of their ministers was “*a small, that little* of this sort can be expected from them!” Insufficiency was one of the alleged sins of the episcopal clergy, for which it was decreed that they should be *purged out* of the new establishment; but even-handed justice requires that the same system should be pursued with the presbyterian ministers, when one of themselves solemnly charges the whole body of them with insufficiency and “ignorance of the nature of the gospel dispensation!”

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met, as appointed, on the 1st of May; the duke of Athole was sent down as royal commissioner, and the Assembly made choice of William Hamilton to be their moderator. The queen made reiterated assurances of her determination to support and maintain the establishment. On the 13th they made an act approving of the representations and addresses made by the commission of the late General Assembly to the queen, against the toleration of the episcopalians, the restoration of patronages, and the oath of abjuration. And to mark their approbation the more emphatically, they recorded these addresses among the acts of Assembly, and voted an address to the queen, reminding her majesty of the purport of those addresses, and soliciting her protection against their ruinous effects. The duke dissolved

¹ Correspondence, i. 242-251.

the Assembly in the usual way, and appointed the next Assembly to meet on the last Thursday of April, 1713¹.

WODROW relates, that “the last summer the English service was set up almost through all the north of Scotland, and that party grew extremely insolent and outrageous. Our brethren there are in a very sad taking, and need sympathy very much. All the noise and violence of the party was of design to force some opposition from presbyteries, yet I hear of none but that of Perth and Aberdeen that raised processes against these innovations; and the first went on, and deposed one for contumacy and bringing in a *foreign liturgy*. This was made the introduction to the bringing in the bill for protecting those of the episcopal communion in Scotland, which you no doubt know is now passed.” In communicating his thoughts upon the abjuration oath, he says:—“The exauctorate bishops wrote up to their friends to drop the toleration, most of them and their dependents being absolutely against the oaths; and now I hear they resolve to wait and see what our practice will be. And I suppose, in the meantime, they will get down journeymen from England who will take the oaths and begin the schism in this church².” In another letter he says, “You may depend upon it that the whole of the episcopal clergy will go into the oath. This I am well informed of at Edinburgh, and I find it comes from a spur from the south—from the bishop of London and the archbishop of York³.” It appears therefore to be incontestible, that, when left at liberty, the people beyond the Tay, almost universally, preferred episcopacy and the liturgy. Bishop Rose ordained Mr. JAMES RAIT, who was afterwards a bishop, and he officiated for three years in a parish church in the county of Forfar. Mr. Rait got no stipend; it was received by the legal presbyterian minister who was ordained in a field near the church, but which the people would never allow the legal ministers to enter⁴.

HETHERINGTON, who absolutely raves like a man demented on the subject of the restoration of patronages, says, “But the friends of the church of Scotland had reason also to be disappointed by the conduct of the General Assembly. Had her councils been at that time guided by a Knox, a Melville, or a Henderson, instead of a Carstares, there can be little doubt that the Assembly would not only have declared the act of patronage an infraction of the treaty of Union, as indeed

¹ Acts of Assembly, 459-478.—Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 274-300.

² Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 302, 303.

³ Ibid. 314.

⁴ Bishop Walker's Charge, 1832, Note A, 36.

fact of the advance of the liturgy most dolorously, and poses some remedies for counteracting the progress of episcopacy, toleration, and patronage, which he calls corrupt and growing evils. He commences with recommending public discussions; but he recollects that there might be considerable damage done to themselves, for he found that it "noblemen, gentlemen, and people of better rank, who most inclined to these innovations, and who influence commonalty." Then he lets out the secret, that notwithstanding their allegation of the divine origin of presbytery, were quite *unacquainted* with the episcopal controversy. He says, "I wish we that are called to be watchmen at juncture, *were more acquainted* with the nature of the dispensation and the spirituality of it, and *studied the controversy* betwixt us and our neighbours in England more, we might be riper in conference and close and solid reasonings, as occasion offers. I want not my own fears many of us *be lame on this point*, which seems to be the sent truth in which we ought to be established." He confesses the "*sufficiency*" of many of their ministers was *small*, that little of this sort can be expected from the Insufficiency was one of the alleged sins of the episcopal clergy, for which it was decreed that they should be *put out* of the new establishment; but even-handed justice requires that the same system should be pursued with the presbyterian ministers, when one of themselves solemnly charges the whole body of them with insufficiency and "ignorance of the nature of the gospel dispensation!"

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met, as appointed, on the 1st of May; the duke of Athole was sent down as royal commissioner, and the Assembly made choice of William Hamilton to be their moderator. The queen made reiterated assurances of her determination to support and maintain the establishment. On the 13th they made an act approving of the representations and addresses made by the commission of the General Assembly to the queen, against the toleration of episcopalians, the restoration of patronages, and the oath of abjuration. And to mark their approbation the more emphatically, they recorded these addresses among the acts of the assembly, and voted an address to the queen, reminding her majesty of the purport of those addresses, and soliciting her protection against their ruinous effects. The duke dis-

¹ Correspondence, i. 242-251.

the Assembly in the usual way, and appointed the next Assembly to meet on the last Thursday of April, 1713¹.

WODROW relates, that "the last summer the English service was set up almost through all the north of Scotland, and that party grew extremely insolent and outrageous. Our brethren there are in a very sad taking, and need sympathy very much. All the noise and violence of the party was of design to force some opposition from presbyteries, yet I hear of none but that of Perth and Aberdeen that raised processes against these innovations; and the first went on, and deposed one for contumacy and bringing in a *foreign liturgy*. This was made the introduction to the bringing in the bill for protecting those of the episcopal communion in Scotland, which you no doubt know is now passed." In communicating his thoughts upon the abjuration oath, he says:—"The exauctorate bishops wrote up to their friends to drop the toleration, most of them and their dependents being absolutely against the oaths; and now I hear they resolve to wait and see what our practice will be. And I suppose, in the meantime, they will get down journeymen from England who will take the oaths and begin the schism in this church²." In another letter he says, "You may depend upon it that the whole of the episcopal clergy will go into the oath. This I am well informed of at Edinburgh, and I find it comes from a spur from the south—from the bishop of London and the archbishop of York³." It appears therefore to be incontestible, that, when left at liberty, the people beyond the Tay, almost universally, preferred episcopacy and the liturgy. Bishop Rose ordained Mr. JAMES RAIT, who was afterwards a bishop, and he officiated for three years in a parish church in the county of Forfar. Mr. Rait got no stipend; it was received by the legal presbyterian minister who was ordained in a field near the church, but which the people would never allow the legal ministers to enter⁴.

HETHERINGTON, who absolutely raves like a man demented on the subject of the restoration of patronages, says, "But the friends of the church of Scotland had reason also to be disappointed by the conduct of the General Assembly. Had her councils been at that time guided by a Knox, a Melville, or a Henderson, instead of a Carstares, there can be little doubt that the Assembly would not only have declared the act of patronage an infraction of the treaty of Union, as indeed

¹ Acts of Assembly, 459-478.—Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 274-300.

² Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 302, 303.

³ Ibid. 314.

⁴ Bishop Walker's Charge, 1832, Note A, 36.

was done, but also that they would have declared it that very reason, necessarily and essentially invalid would have passed an act *strictly prohibiting* all prebendaries, ministers, and church courts, from yielding to it *the degree of obedience*, leaving it to the civil powers to enforcing it by persecution or otherwise, *if they could DARED* ¹!" Such, then, is the teaching of the non-independent free kirk, in the year of grace 1843. On the other side, ever, a more sensible presbyterian author acknowledges the benefit which the kirk has derived from the patronage system, and the fact, it contributed to give her that respectable position which she has of late years enjoyed. "The experience of sixty years has at last evinced," he says, "what it was possible for human sagacity then to discover, that the act of toleration, and the act restoring patronages, which were considered by the friends of the church of Scotland as measures in her interests, and which were probably intended as a remedy for the evils which would have resulted from the introduction of greater changes, have proved the source of her greatest security, and the remedy of those evils which she had then dreaded most from the concessions in favour of the episcopacy at the Revolution. Upon the one hand, the act of toleration, by taking the weapon of offence out of the hands of the presbyterians, removed the chief ground of those objections which the friends of prelacy entertained against the act, and in a few years almost annihilated episcopacy in Scotland. Upon the other hand, the act restoring patronages, by bringing the nobility and gentlemen of property to their own assistance in the settlement of the clergy, reconciled numbers of them to the established church who had conceived the most violent prejudices against that mode of election, and against the presbyterian clergy who were settled upon it. It is likewise a contestible fact, that from the date of these two acts the church of Scotland has enjoyed a state of tranquillity which she was a perfect stranger before. There is no advantage flowing from the act of toleration, which was not impossible to foresee, viz. that the very people whose opposition led them most eagerly to oppose it, have derived the greatest if not the sole benefit from it ²."

SOME, however, of the more rigid of the presbyterians were highly indignant at the acts of toleration and patronage, and a body of zealots met at Auchiesaugh, near Doune, in the diocese of Glasgow; and after a general acknowledgment

¹ History, 196, 199.

² Life of Carstares, prefixed to State Papers, p. 85.

ment of the right-hand backslidings and left-hand defections of the kirk, made their testimony against the national sin of tolerating and relieving the episcopalians and the imposition of the yoke of patronage ; and concluded with an act of high treason, by solemnly swearing and renewing the Covenant.

1713.—THE DREADFUL state of persecution to which the church had been so long subjected, had occasioned a number of disorders and defects in it, which her governors were now, during her momentary prosperity, anxious to remedy. Among other things, the apostolic right of confirmation had been entirely disused, from the difficulty the clergy and people experienced in finding suitable and safe places in which to assemble and meet together. The bishops now endeavoured to restore this sacred rite of the church, and in this pious effort bishop Falconar was particularly zealous and active. But a difficulty occurred, which perplexed the bishops, in the mode of administration. In the course of a twenty-five years' persecution, the clergy were sternly prohibited, under severe penalties, from receiving the lambs of their flocks into Christ's family by the sacrament of baptism ; and many others, who would now present themselves for confirmation, had received only lay sprinkling from the established minister. Bishop Falconar took the initiative in the revival of this good and apostolical work, and wrote to the primate upon the subject, who being in an equal degree perplexed, returned the following answer :—

“ REVEREND BROTHER,—The desire of the person you wrote of seems to me to have great reason on its side, and I wish that case had been taken under consideration, and decided either by our own or any other rightly constituted protestant church, which, so far as I know, has not yet been done ; nay, the practice and sense of our neighbour church [of England] looks to be against it ; upon what warrantable principle, or how agreeable to some other, both of their principles and practices, I am yet to learn. But as for the thing itself, it wants not perplexing difficulties on both sides ; and though I have often thought upon it, yet I must own that I am scarce able to resolve myself clearly as to what may be fit to be done in cases of that nature. I am loath to annul all such baptisms, and to impeach both our own church and others that seem to allow them, in so far that they allow those persons, who have no other [baptism], all christian privileges. On the other hand, I do not know how to own the validity of what is done without a commission. For my own part, I make a dif-

ference between those who are satisfied, or have no doubt about their baptism, and those who have. As to the reckoning of their baptisms, though invalid in matter of *right*, so in matter of *fact*; and that through the divine inducement from the churches in which they live, their admission and acceptance of them, and the insuperable difficulties which a greater part of people are under to know otherwise; the church's admitting of such baptisms, though no farther than to pass a censure upon them, seems to me to put these *in bonâ fide* to rely upon such baptisms, and I hope they shall sustain no prejudice in that case; but how the goodness of the church shall account for affording that ground of confidence, I do not know. But for the others, who, upon the authority of judgment, after diligent inquiry and weighty consideration, scruple the validity of their baptism, their case is to be very different from that of the others; and I find it hard to reject them, when they crave to have the defect of their former baptism supplied; but this I think fit to leave in the way and manner you wrote of, and that upon many obvious and weighty considerations. God Almighty direct and give us all fuller and clearer light, and establish all truth among us upon the true ancient foundations¹."

THE VALIDITY and the efficacy, or grace of a sacrament are two things quite distinct. Confirmation cannot give validity to that which is of itself invalid: but it can give the Spirit *quicken* the grace of a valid sacrament which had been hindered under some impediment which had prevented the gift; such as schism, heresy, or impenitence. It may restore the grace by removing the impediment, but it cannot make that to be a sacrament which was none before. The church has decided that lay baptism is valid, if administered with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and with the intention of doing what the church does; that is, with the intention of baptizing, the things which were wanting in the administration being afterwards supplied. But it is to be observed, that the rule is only to cases of *necessity*, and it may fairly be doubted if such baptisms as are referred to in bishop Rose's letter are under that category. The probability is that they do not; it is believed that the practice of western christendom would admit them upon the individual so baptized being received into the church by imposition of the bishop's hands. S

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 613, 614.

case is by no means free from doubt on other grounds. Protestant dissenting bodies, of all sorts, have such low, if not profane, notions of the sacraments, and are so careless and irreverent in the mode of administering them, that their baptisms can never be free from some degree of uncertainty whether they have really been administered in such a manner as the rule of the church requires. There seems, therefore, to be charity and a holy carefulness about so great a thing, with a due fear at the same time of a repetition of the *one baptism*, in making provision, as the XVIIth canon of the Scottish church does, for baptizing in the *hypothetic* form those persons who have received the sacrament under the circumstances of doubt and uncertainty referred to. The decision of a "rightly constituted protestant church," which bishop Rose wished for, would obviously be of no value against a previous decision of the whole of western christendom ruling otherwise. Such a decision would be too late and too partial to settle so great a question, and would only serve to involve our practice in still greater embarrassments.

IN ONE OF his letters, Wodrow says, he was in Glasgow on Christmas-day, last year, which probably had fallen on a Sunday, or on one of their weekly preaching days, and he heard a sermon, from one of his own brethren, against holidays. He farther adds, that Mr. Cockburn, an episcopal clergyman there, was unable to administer the Lord's Supper in his chapel, although it was protected by law, having taken the oath of abjuration. This, he says, was a stumbling-block to "the most substantial of the old episcopal way, who refuse to join Mr. Cockburn, because of the Liturgy, and others stumble at him for his qualifying; and those that are with him, particularly Sir D. Macdonald, begin to weary, because of the *charges* they are at." Alas! the love of many was beginning to wax cold, from the same cause. The long existence of sacrilege had obliterated their sense of duty that none should appear *empty* before the Lord. The *material* worship of God, under the law, was *not abrogated* when the law came to an end, but was positively *enjoined and confirmed* under the gospel. St. Paul compares the christian to the Jewish worship, and confirms the one by the other:—"Do ye not know that they who minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? and they who wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar?" That is, the priests and Levites that attended the service of the temple were expressly appointed to be maintained out of the sacrifices and oblations of the people. "*Even so* hath the Lord ordained, that they who preach the gospel, should

LIVE by the GOSPEL." By declaring that the "labourer is worthy of his hire," our Lord has given his apostles and priests the same tithes, and the oblations that are offered on the christ altar, that His worship and gift might be *even so*, as the tithe of the temple in bullocks and rams. Wodrow's wish is a father to his assertion, that the Liturgy was obnoxious to episcopalians; for in the same letter he says, "Upon the 2^d there was a soldier buried in the High Churchyard with English service. This is the first say-hand [essay]. All officers were there, and Mr. Cockburn put on his gown at entry of the churchyard, and ventured not up the street without it; and prayers began, and all the company were discovered [uncovered] from their entry into the churchyard, where many were spectators, but no rabble or opposition. It is a question here, whether the Toleration Act allows the protected ministers to bury *à la mode d'Angleterre*." In another letter he informs us that Mr. Cockburn's stipend was, at the utmost, £22 sterling per annum, and he experienced some difficulty in procuring the regular payment of even that miserable pittance, of which his congregation began to *weary*! ¹

WODROW complains heavily to his friend Dr. Cotton Mather in America, that "we have a boundless toleration put upon us, to the great strengthening of the French and jacobite interest here; and the English service *is setting up in all corners of the church*." This toleration, however, does not seem to have been so boundless as his fears represented; he informs us, that the lord-provost of Glasgow signifies to Mr. Cockburn, that he would not be again permitted to use the English service at funerals. This interdict was imposed when he attempted to bury a female who had died, as Wodrow says, *raging mad*, because Mr. Cockburn had administered the communion to her in private². This is one of those "remarks that shews, in his opinion, the danger of tolerating the English liturgy. In a letter to Mr. Hart, he also alludes to a meeting of the episcopal clergy at Edinburgh, "anent praying, what is, I am sure, contrary to several of their principles. In reply, Mr. Hart, who was one of the ministers of Edinburgh, informs him, "My lord Dunn has also (it seems by order from above) had a meeting with the bishop of Edinburgh, as they call him, with those of the episcopal clergy who keep meeting-houses in this city, in which he told them that their best friends in London could do them no farther service, unless they prayed expressly for queen Anne and

¹ Correspondence, i. 362, 375.

² Ibid. 390, 400, 404.

Hanoverian succession, and if they did not, they might expect that all their meeting-houses might be shut up; but it seems they were not all of one mind as to this: some were for complying with what was proposed, others for taking it into consideration, and a third sort for refusing it altogether, who seemed to act most agreeably to their principles; but what they will centre in is yet uncertain; for this night, I understand, they meet again¹."

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met on the 30th of April, the duke of Athole commissioner, and William Wishart, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, was chosen moderator. The queen's letter again contains an assurance of her protection and preservation of their establishment, and an implied affirmation, that it was only on condition of their good behaviour that she permitted the Assembly to meet at all. In one of Wodrow's epistles to his wife from this Assembly, he says,—“There are lamentable representations [made to the Assembly] of the effects of the Toleration in the north. The episcopal party meet in sessions and presbyteries, and license young men, and mar all discipline by taking off persons from their appearances before [presbyterian] ministers, and passing them at their meetings very overly.” In another letter he says, that in the northern highlands “the English Catechism is printed in Irish, and part of the Service, because, they say, all that can read at all understand the English, and it will be of little use to them who cannot read².”

THE ATTENTION of this Assembly was chiefly occupied with the subject of the abjuration oath; many of the ministers absolutely refused to take it; the people generally were opposed to it, and they deserted the jurants, as they were called, to run after the preaching of the non-jurant ministers, who fiercely denounced their jurant brethren as perjured traitors to the cause. It required all Dr. Carstares' tact and management to prevent a formal schism in the kirk, and he was the means of procuring an act of Assembly “for maintaining the unity and peace of this church,” and to inculcate mutual forbearance on both parties with regard to the taking or not taking this unlucky oath. The commissioner dissolved the Assembly on the 11th of May, and appointed the next to meet on the first Thursday, being the 6th of May next year³.

IT MAY BE necessary to mention in this place an irregular step taken by the two Scottish bishops that usually resided in

¹ Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 436.

² Correspondence, i. 455-458.

³ Acts of Assembly, 478-484.

fact of the advance of the liturgy most dolorously, and proposes some remedies for counteracting the progress of episcopacy, toleration, and patronage, which he calls corruptions and growing evils. He commences with recommending public discussions; but he recollects that there might be considerable damage done to themselves, for he found that it was "noblemen, gentlemen, and people of better rank, who were most inclined to these innovations, and who influence the commonalty." Then he lets out the secret, that notwithstanding their allegation of the divine origin of presbytery, they were quite *unacquainted* with the episcopal controversy. He says, "I wish we that are called to be watchmen at this juncture, *were more acquainted* with the nature of the *gospel* dispensation and the spirituality of it, and *studied the controversy* betwixt us and our neighbours in England more, that we might be riper in conference and close and solid in our reasonings, as occasion offers. I want not my own fears that many of us *be lame on this point*, which seems to be the present truth in which we ought to be established." He confesses the "*sufficiency*" of many of their ministers was "*so small, that little* of this sort can be expected from them¹." Insufficiency was one of the alleged sins of the episcopal clergy, for which it was decreed that they should be *purged out* of the new establishment; but even-handed justice requires that the same system should be pursued with the presbyterian ministers, when one of themselves solemnly charges the whole body of them with insufficiency and "ignorance of the nature of the gospel dispensation!"

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met, as appointed, on the 1st of May; the duke of Athole was sent down as royal commissioner, and the Assembly made choice of William Hamilton to be their moderator. The queen made reiterated assurances of her determination to support and maintain the establishment. On the 13th they made an act approving of the representations and addresses made by the commission of the late General Assembly to the queen, against the toleration of the episcopalians, the restoration of patronages, and the oath of abjuration. And to mark their approbation the more emphatically, they recorded these addresses among the acts of Assembly, and voted an address to the queen, reminding her majesty of the purport of those addresses, and soliciting her protection against their ruinous effects. The duke dissolved

¹ Correspondence, i. 242-251.

the Assembly in the usual way, and appointed the next Assembly to meet on the last Thursday of April, 1713¹.

WODROW relates, that "the last summer the English service was set up almost through all the north of Scotland, and that party grew extremely insolent and outrageous. Our brethren there are in a very sad taking, and need sympathy very much. All the noise and violence of the party was of design to force some opposition from presbyteries, yet I hear of none but that of Perth and Aberdeen that raised processes against these innovations; and the first went on, and deposed one for contumacy and bringing in a *foreign liturgy*. This was made the introduction to the bringing in the bill for protecting those of the episcopal communion in Scotland, which you no doubt know is now passed." In communicating his thoughts upon the abjuration oath, he says:—"The exauctorate bishops wrote up to their friends to drop the toleration, most of them and their dependents being absolutely against the oaths; and now I hear they resolve to wait and see what our practice will be. And I suppose, in the meantime, they will get down journeymen from England who will take the oaths and begin the schism in this church²." In another letter he says, "You may depend upon it that the whole of the episcopal clergy will go into the oath. This I am well informed of at Edinburgh, and I find it comes from a spur from the south—from the bishop of London and the archbishop of York³." It appears therefore to be incontestible, that, when left at liberty, the people beyond the Tay, almost universally, preferred episcopacy and the liturgy. Bishop Rose ordained Mr. JAMES RAIT, who was afterwards a bishop, and he officiated for three years in a parish church in the county of Forfar. Mr. Rait got no stipend; it was received by the legal presbyterian minister who was ordained in a field near the church, but which the people would never allow the legal ministers to enter⁴.

HETHERINGTON, who absolutely raves like a man demented on the subject of the restoration of patronages, says, "But the friends of the church of Scotland had reason also to be disappointed by the conduct of the General Assembly. Had her councils been at that time guided by a Knox, a Melville, or a Henderson, instead of a Carstares, there can be little doubt that the Assembly would not only have declared the act of patronage an infraction of the treaty of Union, as indeed

¹ Acts of Assembly, 459-478.—Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 274-300.

² Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 302, 303.

³ Ibid. 314.

⁴ Bishop Walker's Charge, 1832, Note A, 36.

was done, but also that they would have declared it to be, for that very reason, necessarily and essentially invalid; and would have passed an act *strictly prohibiting* all probationers, ministers, and church courts, from yielding to it *the slightest degree of obedience*, leaving it to the civil powers to attempt enforcing it by persecution or otherwise, *if they could and DARED* ¹!" Such, then, is the teaching of the non-intrusion or free kirk, in the year of grace 1843. On the other side, however, a more sensible presbyterian author acknowledges the benefit which the kirk has derived from the patronage act; in fact, it contributed to give her that respectable position which she has of late years enjoyed. "The experience of sixty years has at last evinced," he says, "what it was impossible for human sagacity then to discover, that the act for toleration, and the act restoring patronages, which were considered by the friends of the church of Scotland as fatal to her interests, and which were probably intended as the preludes of greater changes, have proved the source of her greatest security, and the remedy of those evils which Mr. Carstares dreaded most from the concessions in favour of presbytery at the Revolution. Upon the one hand, the act of toleration, by taking the weapon of offence out of the hands of the presbyterians, removed the chief ground of those resentments which the friends of prelacy entertained against them and in a few years almost annihilated episcopacy in Scotland. Upon the other hand, the act restoring patronages, by restoring the nobility and gentlemen of property to their wonted influence in the settlement of the clergy, reconciled numbers of them to the established church who had conceived the most violent prejudices against that mode of election, and the presbyterian clergy who were settled upon it. It is likewise an incontestible fact, that from the date of these two acts the church of Scotland has enjoyed a state of tranquillity to which she was a perfect stranger before. There is another advantage flowing from the act of toleration, which it was impossible to foresee, viz. that the very people whose principles led them most eagerly to oppose it, have derived the greatest if not the sole benefit from it ²."

SOME, however, of the more rigid of the presbyterian were highly indignant at the acts of toleration and patronage and a body of zealots met at Auchiesaugh, near Douglass, in the diocese of Glasgow; and after a general acknowledg-

¹ History, 198, 199.

² Life of Carstares, prefixed to State Papers, p. 85.

ment of the right-hand backslidings and left-hand defections of the kirk, made their testimony against the national sin of tolerating and relieving the episcopalians and the imposition of the yoke of patronage ; and concluded with an act of high treason, by solemnly swearing and renewing the Covenant.

1713.—THE DREADFUL state of persecution to which the church had been so long subjected, had occasioned a number of disorders and defects in it, which her governors were now, during her momentary prosperity, anxious to remedy. Among other things, the apostolic right of confirmation had been entirely disused, from the difficulty the clergy and people experienced in finding suitable and safe places in which to assemble and meet together. The bishops now endeavoured to restore this sacred rite of the church, and in this pious effort bishop Falconar was particularly zealous and active. But a difficulty occurred, which perplexed the bishops, in the mode of administration. In the course of a twenty-five years' persecution, the clergy were sternly prohibited, under severe penalties, from receiving the lambs of their flocks into Christ's family by the sacrament of baptism ; and many others, who would now present themselves for confirmation, had received only lay sprinkling from the established minister. Bishop Falconar took the initiative in the revival of this good and apostolical work, and wrote to the primate upon the subject, who being in an equal degree perplexed, returned the following answer :—

“REVEREND BROTHER,—The desire of the person you wrote of seems to me to have great reason on its side, and I wish that case had been taken under consideration, and decided either by our own or any other rightly constituted protestant church, which, so far as I know, has not yet been done ; nay, the practice and sense of our neighbour church [of England] looks to be against it ; upon what warrantable principle, or how agreeable to some other, both of their principles and practices, I am yet to learn. But as for the thing itself, it wants not perplexing difficulties on both sides ; and though I have often thought upon it, yet I must own that I am scarce able to resolve myself clearly as to what may be fit to be done in cases of that nature. I am loath to annul all such baptisms, and to impeach both our own church and others that seem to allow them, in so far that they allow those persons, who have no other [baptism], all christian privileges. On the other hand, I do not know how to own the validity of what is done without a commission. For my own part, I make a dif-

LIVE by the GOSPEL." By declaring that the "labourer is worthy of his hire," our Lord has given his apostles and priests the same tithes, and the oblations that are offered on the christian altar, that His worship and gift might be *even so*, as the tithes of the temple in bullocks and rams. Wodrow's wish was father to his assertion, that the Liturgy was obnoxious to the episcopalians; for in the same letter he says, "Upon the 29th there was a soldier buried in the High Churchyard with the English service. This is the first say-hand [essay]. All the officers were there, and Mr. Cockburn put on his gown at the entry of the churchyard, and ventured not up the street with it; and prayers began, and all the company were discovered [uncovered] from their entry into the churchyard, where many were spectators, but no rabble or opposition. It is a question here, whether the Toleration Act allows the protected ministers to bury *à la mode d'Angleterre*." In another letter he informs us that Mr. Cockburn's stipend was, at the utmost, £22 sterling per annum, and he experienced some difficulty in procuring the regular payment of even that miserable pittance, of which his congregation began to *weary*!¹

WODROW complains heavily to his friend Dr. Cotton Mather, in America, that "we have a boundless toleration put upon us, to the great strengthening of the French and jacobite interest here; and the English service *is setting up in all the corners of the church*." This toleration, however, does not seem to have been so boundless as his fears represented; for he informs us, that the lord-provost of Glasgow signified to Mr. Cockburn, that he would not be again permitted to use the service at funerals. This interdict was imposed when he was about to bury a female who had died, as Wodrow says, raving mad, because Mr. Cockburn had administered the communion to her in private². This is one of those "remarkables" that shews, in his opinion, the danger of tolerating the Liturgy. In a letter to Mr. Hart, he also alludes to a meeting of the episcopal clergy at Edinburgh, "anent praying for what is, I am sure, contrary to several of their principles." In reply, Mr. Hart, who was one of the ministers of Edinburgh, informs him, "My lord Dunn has also (it seems by order from above) had a meeting with the bishop of Edinburgh, as they call him, with those of the episcopal clergy who keep meeting-houses in this city, in which he told them that their best friends in London could do them no farther service, unless they prayed expressly for queen Anne and the

¹ Correspondence, i. 362, 375.

² Ibid. 390, 400, 404.

Hanoverian succession, and if they did not, they might expect that all their meeting-houses might be shut up; but it seems they were not all of one mind as to this: some were for complying with what was proposed, others for taking it into consideration, and a third sort for refusing it altogether, who seemed to act most agreeably to their principles; but what they will centre in is yet uncertain; for this night, I understand, they meet again¹."

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met on the 30th of April, the duke of Athole commissioner, and William Wishart, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, was chosen moderator. The queen's letter again contains an assurance of her protection and preservation of their establishment, and an implied affirmation, that it was only on condition of their good behaviour that she permitted the Assembly to meet at all. In one of Wodrow's epistles to his wife from this Assembly, he says,—“There are lamentable representations [made to the Assembly] of the effects of the Toleration in the north. The episcopal party meet in sessions and presbyteries, and license young men, and mar all discipline by taking off persons from their appearances before [presbyterian] ministers, and passing them at their meetings very overly.” In another letter he says, that in the northern highlands “the English Catechism is printed in Irish, and part of the Service, because, they say, all that can read at all understand the English, and it will be of little use to them who cannot read².”

THE ATTENTION of this Assembly was chiefly occupied with the subject of the abjuration oath; many of the ministers absolutely refused to take it; the people generally were opposed to it, and they deserted the jurants, as they were called, to run after the preaching of the non-jurant ministers, who fiercely denounced their jurant brethren as perjured traitors to the cause. It required all Dr. Carstares' tact and management to prevent a formal schism in the kirk, and he was the means of procuring an act of Assembly “for maintaining the unity and peace of this church,” and to inculcate mutual forbearance on both parties with regard to the taking or not taking this unlucky oath. The commissioner dissolved the Assembly on the 11th of May, and appointed the next to meet on the first Thursday, being the 6th of May next year³.

IT MAY BE necessary to mention in this place an irregular step taken by the two Scottish bishops that usually resided in

¹ Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 436.

² Correspondence, i. 455-458.

³ Acts of Assembly, 478-484.

London, in conjunction with bishop Hicke. By this time all the English deprived bishops, with Dr. Wagstaffe, one of the first whom they had consecrated, were dead; but Dr. Hicke determined to keep up a succession in the line of Dr. Sancroft for which purpose he applied to bishops Campbell and Gaderar to assist him. These two, "paying more regard," say Mr. Perceval, "apparently to their political attachments than to the canons of the church, agreed to meddle with the affair of a province in which they had no voice, and, together with Hicke, consecrated Collier, Spinckes, and Hawes," on the 3d of June. They afterwards also assisted Dr. Collier in consecrating Henry Gandy and Thomas Brett, in the year 1715.

THE QUEEN ordered a general thanksgiving to be observed after the conclusion of the peace of Utrecht. This was a new source of division to the kirk; and Wodrow says, it "is an will be a new trial to this church, and I am apprehensive it will crumble us into pieces, and set up a new division." The jurants, or those who took the abjuration oath, generally, as well as some of the non-jurants, refused to keep the day. "The keeping of the thanksgiving has been generally neglected in this church. This will of new lay us open to the queen's mercy. . . . It is our unhappiness in some respects, and in others perhaps not, that our left-hand brethren, the protectors of the episcopal party, have neither fallen in generally with the oath nor this day of thanksgiving. As to the last, they think that their prince has too much done against him in this peace; and we are of opinion there is too little done effectually against him. Only two of them [the episcopal clergy] at Edinburg who qualified, kept the thanksgiving; the rest did not; nor anywhere through the country, that I hear of." The exiled prince sent a printed protest to each of the ministers assembled at Utrecht, under the style of James III. and VIII. "— That since he understood that the confederate powers had no regard to his right, he thought himself most indispensably obliged to himself, to posterity, and to his subjects, not to seem, by his silence, to consent to what was transacting the prejudice of him and the lawful heirs of his kingdom and therefore he solemnly protested against all that might be agreed to or stipulated to his prejudice, as being void by all the laws in the word¹."

THE PEOPLE of Scotland were very much dissatisfied at the time with the imposition of a tax on malt; and serious proposals were made for dissolving the Union. The royal ex-

¹ Perceval's Apology, 246, 247.

² Boyer's History of Queen Anne, 631

was also looked to with a favourable eye as a successor to the queen; and two remarkable addresses were presented to the queen in his favour. One was presented by sir Hugh Patterson, from the magistrates and town council of Inverness, wherein, among other things, they said,—“ We without reserve depend on your majesty’s wisdom in securing our religion and the succession to the hereditary crown of Great Britain in the family of your *royal progenitors*, the most ancient line of succession in the world; being as much convinced that our guarantee is entirely in your hands, as your serene majesty does place yours in your people.” The other address was from the town-council and inhabitants of Nairn:—“ We know not with what modesty we can presume to address your majesty in the matter of succession, lest we should seem to call in question your majesty’s unquestionable prudence, or the faithfulness of your majesty’s council; and therefore we sincerely declare, that our utmost wishes reach no farther than that our posterity may reap the effects of your majesty’s wise choice, while we think ourselves happy under your majesty’s administration all our days¹.”

DR. SACHEVEREL’S suspension ended on Monday the 23d of March, and that day was celebrated in London, and many parts of England, with extraordinary rejoicings, as if it had been for the restoration of a sovereign, or deliverance from some public calamity. Besides the ringing of bells, bonfires, and illuminations, one Jones, a founder in Southwark, fired off three rounds of his artillery, consisting of thirteen small canons. On the following Sunday, the 29th of March, the Doctor preached in the forenoon at St. Saviour’s church, in the Borough, where an immense multitude thronged to hear and see him. To mark their disapprobation of his former sentence, the Commons desired him to preach before them, in St. Margaret’s Church, on the 29th of May, being the Restoration, and he received the thanks of the House for his sermon; and, as a mark of royal favour, he was presented to the rectory of St. Andrew’s, Holborn².

IN SEPTEMBER, the city of Edinburgh returned Mr. Lockhart, of Carnwath, as their representative in the imperial parliament, although he was known to be an agent for the exiled prince; and a great number of the inhabitants drew up and signed a petition, entrusting it to him to present to the House of Commons, to bring in a bill for the dissolution of the union. After the election the populace went to the Parliament Close,

¹ Boyer’s History of Queen Anne, 641.

² Ibid. 642, 643.

and surrounding the noble equestrian statue of Charles II., drank to the queen's health, to the dissolution of the union, and to the healths of all true Scotsmen. They went next to the market-cross, and performed a similar ceremony for the same effect, with repeated acclamations.

ON THE 8th of June, the princess Sophia, or "Auld Suphy," as the Jacobites called her, died, while walking in the garden at Herenhausen, of a fit of apoplexy, in her eighty-fourth year. She was the fourth or youngest daughter of Frederick, king of Bohemia, and Elizabeth Stuart, princess royal of England, and daughter of James I. and VI. She was born at the Hague on the 3d of October, 1630, and married to Ernest Augustus, duke of Brunswick and Lunenburgh, fourth and youngest son to George, duke of Lunenburgh-Zell. He succeeded to the bishoprick of Osnaburgh on the death of count Francis of Wirtemberg in 1662; and to his elder brother John Frederick, duke of Hanover, in the year 1680, and in 1692 he received the investiture of the electoral dignity of Brunswick-Lunenburgh. This potent prince died on the 23d of January, 1698, having had issue by the princess Sophia, GEORGE LEWIS, and other five sons, and one daughter, Sophia Dorothy, who, in the year 1684, became the second wife of Frederick III., king of Prussia¹.

LEAVE WAS given in May to bring a bill into the Commons "to prevent the growth of schism, and for the further security of the Church of England, as by law established." On the 22d of May, leave was obtained to bring in a bill "for vesting the revenues and rents, which did belong to the archbishops and bishops of that part of Great Britain called Scotland, in her majesty, her heirs and successors, to be by them applied to the support and maintenance of the episcopal clergy there." In order to render this bill ineffectual, the whig members proposed that the words should be added, after the words "episcopal clergy there," "who shall pray for her majesty and the princess Sophia in express words, and conform to the liturgy of the Church of England." This was not opposed by those who brought in the bill. At the same time it was resolved to address her majesty, "for an account of what rents and revenues, formerly belonging to the archbishops and bishops in Scotland, were now vested in the crown; what grants had been made out of the same, to what uses, and upon what considerations." So much of the revenues of the episcopal clergy

¹ Salmon's Chronological Historian, ii. p. 31.—Boyer's History of Queen Anne, 700, 701.

had been bestowed on the presbyterians at the Revolution, that it was found their resumption would produce so much discontent and turbulence among them, as to be dangerous to the peace of the kingdom. On that account, and also on account of the above-mentioned amendment, the bill was dropped, and nothing was done for the relief of the necessities of the bishops and clergy of Scotland. In the course of the debates on the bill for preventing the growth of schism, the presbyterians instinctively presented a petition, praying that they might be heard by counsel against the bill; but their petition was rejected by a majority of only six¹.

1714.—THE ASSEMBLY again met on the 6th of May, the duke of Atholl commissioner, and William Mitchell moderator. A charge of teaching Arminian doctrines was brought before the Assembly against professor Simpson, which shall be noticed afterwards. The principal business was the preparation of an address to her majesty against the growth of popery, and “the disorders of some of the episcopal persuasion.” Hetherington has the audacity to say, that “Scottish prelatists” would more consult the credit of their ancestors, and their own reputation for knowledge and veracity, did they allow the records of those mendacious tales [of presbyterian persecution] to sink into oblivion, lest it become necessary for the church of Scotland, in her own defence, to drag anew their deeds of darkness to the light².” Such is the delusion even of modern times.

ON THE 29th of July her majesty was taken dangerously ill, with a great heaviness and shooting pains in her head: cupping gave her temporary relief; but her indisposition returned, and she was seized with a fit of apoplexy. After having been bled, she rallied again, and lay in a sort of lethargy till the 1st of August, when she died a little after seven in the morning, in the fiftieth year of her age, and the thirteenth of her reign. She was second daughter of James, duke of York and Albany, by his first wife, the lady Anne, daughter of Edward Hyde, chancellor of the exchequer, and afterwards lord chancellor of England. She was baptized at St. James’s Palace; her eldest sister, the lady Mary, and the duchess of Monmouth, were her godmothers, and Dr. Sheldon, archbishop of Canterbury, was her godfather. On the 28th of July, 1683, she was married to prince George, second son to Frederick III., king of Denmark, and had issue by him—1st, a daughter, still-born, on the 12th of May, 1684; 2, the lady Mary, born at

¹ Boyer’s History, 705.

² History, 202.

Whitehall, 2d of June, 1685, and died in February, 1686 3, lady Anne Sophia, born at Windsor, 12th of May, 1686—died the February following; 4, William, duke of Gloucester born at Hampton Court the 24th of July, 1689, and who lived till the age of eleven; 5, the lady Mary, born at St James's in October, 1690, but died soon after she was baptized 6, prince George, born at Sion House, 17th of April, 1692 and died immediately after.

THUS DIED ANNE STUART, the last direct descendant of the illustrious and far-descended house that wore the crown, the glory and renown of which she had exalted to a higher pitch than that to which it had attained under any of her most martial predecessors. She was a princess of as many virtues as ever adorned private life, and of as few frailties as ever blemished a diadem. The persecution of the church during her reign proceeded from evil counsellors, who kept her in ignorance of the sufferings of her episcopalian subjects; and who intercepted the good she really intended to have done to them. It was not till after the dismissal of the whigs from office that the church enjoyed comparative rest for a brief space, when she was permitted to hear the complaints of her faithful people. The Act of Toleration, commonly called "the Tenth of Queen Anne," was a great boon to the church, and operates to this day. The English Act of Toleration tolerates nothing; it only *suspends* the penalties annexed to dissent, and to breaches of the act of uniformity, whilst the act of uniformity itself still remains in full force. But the Scottish act was to preserve the very being of the church, the members of which can in no sense whatever be considered as dissenters. On the contrary, the kirk of Scotland is merely the establishment of a powerful and numerous sect of dissenters from the universal church, both in doctrine and government. The Scottish establishment claimed the right of private judgment to an unlimited extent; but it would not cede any particle of that right to the church, either in government or in worship. Persecution is a fundamental principle in its constitution, rivetted by the Solemn League and Covenant; and therefore, whenever it has had the power, it has persecuted, and endeavoured to *extirpate* the church. St. Paul says, "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind;" and the episcopalians were so persuaded that episcopacy was the divinely instituted government of the church, and that there was nothing sinful in the use of a liturgy, more particularly that of England, which they *voluntarily* adopted. It is only *sinful* terms of communion that can justify separation from a true church. We have

separated from Rome, because, although we acknowledge her to be a true church, yet she has corrupted the fundamental principles of religion, and requires her members to join in those corruptions; and supposing that the kirk had been a true church, we should have been obliged to have separated from her also for the same cause, namely, sinful terms of communion. Both a false church, and a true church in which false principles are predominant, have ever been found intolerant and persecuting. Both the popish and presbyterian communions are persecutors whenever the good providence of God has suffered either of them to have the power. The one used fire and faggot, and the other delivered the clergy to the tender mercies of an ignorant, bigotted, and ferocious mob, and have ever since maligned and misrepresented them.

THE OPPOSITION to the liturgy in 1637 was from political and mercenary motives; but now it arose from the fear that sound doctrine and sober religion would induce the people to desert the kirks where the extemporary mode of worship was practised. No presbyterian author of that period mentions the liturgy but with horror; they seem to have been more afraid of it than even of "black prelacy" itself. Their fears, however, were not groundless; for a satirist, writing in the year 1713, says, "Alas! gentlemen, I am afraid ye have but a slippery footing, when there is no ground left you to stand upon but the inclinations of the people, who, dazzled with the seeming beauty and regularity of the English forms that were creeping in among you, *are daily leaving you*, and if I be rightly informed, I should not wish that matters were just now put to a poll, far less in time coming, for, if the friends of the church of England continue their encouragement for promoting their service in Scotland, it will (as I am told) overrun your nation in a short time, and the episcopal party, who have gained no small reputation by a steady and patient suffering of many years, will run you off your feet. And, to be plain with you, I am of opinion, ye are so far from putting a stop to this inundation that is breaking in upon you, that ye have paved the way to your own destruction, by introducing a great many rarities into the church, unknown to all the other parts of the christian world.

"IF A MAN pray to God, when he first enters the church, that God would call in his wandering thoughts, and enable him to present his soul and body a living and acceptable sacrifice unto Him, ye look upon him as pharisaical. If he keep himself *uncovered* all the time he is in the house of God, he is taken notice of as a disaffected person; and if a man venture to say *Amen* after prayer, that is superstition with a witness. I should waive all these as tolerable degrees, at least pretences

of reformation, if ye had stopt here, but I could never yet find out what ails you at the prayer of our Lord, if either it were not commanded in the gospel, which ye would willingly have the world believe is your standard in other cases. If for the disuse of this ye had the example of any one church in the whole world, popish or protestant, or you could plead the authority of our Scots reformers for the neglect of it, I should pass it over; but to be obstinate against Scripture and the universal practice of the christian church, nay, of those of your own persuasion in your neighbour nation, in a matter that gives your enemies so much advantage over you, and so much offence to the wiser among yourselves, looks like infatuation, or a mortal disease either in your wills or understandings. I know, when your neglect of this is objected to you, ye say ye are not against the Lord's Prayer, *i. e.* ye are for it, but not for *saying* it; all I say to this is, that when a man's words and constant practice differ, he is a knave one way or the other; and because the former is by some looked upon as the lesser evil, I (who am for giving you all manner of allowance) shall yield it to be in words; nor have I made this concesssion without sufficient authority. When Mr. Chalmers (a man of freer thoughts than many of his brethren) was called by the duke of Athole to be his minister at Dunkeld, his grace required of him, as a preliminary to his call, that he should every Lord's-day say the Lord's Prayer in the church, to which Mr. Chalmers gave a hearty and ready compliance. But how soon this bold attempt came to be noised abroad, and was notified to the presbytery, it gave no small offence to the brethren; and to obviate such a dangerous innovation, this important affair was brought before the synod of Perth, who made an act of uniformity, the plain meaning of which was, that as none other within the bounds of the said synod used to say the Lord's Prayer, neither should he; and in conformity to this order he was forced to drop it, or it had gone very hard with him. But to put this matter beyond dispute, when Mr. James Stewart was obliged, at his admission, to give his assent to and subscribe this act of uniformity, he did it with this express *reserve*, which he put down with his own hand, that it should not tie him down from saying the Lord's Prayer. This was a reserve of such a dangerous tendency, that it was again brought before the synod; the event of which was, that the said Mr. James should be *reprimanded*, and his *reserve* expunged from the records; and, as I am informed, that gentleman has turned wiser since than to run his head a second time against the wall¹."

¹ Causes of the Decay of Presbytery in Scotland, 13-16.

THE ASSEMBLY agreed to an humble address to her majesty, "against the bold and insolent carriage of popish bishops, priests, jesuits, and other trafficking papists," who had "perverted several hundreds in a few parishes;" and that their "bishops confirmed great multitudes, as in a popish country." But the principal object of the address lies in the following paragraph:—"Though we own ourselves, both as christians and as ministers, indispensably bound to exercise charity towards protestants that differ from us, yet we cannot forbear to represent to your majesty the disorders of some of the episcopal persuasion, who transgress your laws by possessing themselves of parish churches, and introducing thereinto a way of worship never allowed in this church, and manifestly contrary to the act for securing presbyterian government, declared to be a fundamental act of the Union, of which we have a pregnant instance by the late violent and tumultuary invasion of the church of Old Aberdeen; and however fond some of that way appear to be of the Liturgy of the church of England, they do either altogether omit the prayers for your majesty, or make such alterations of these prayers as render them equally applicable to the pretender as to your majesty¹."

THE INCREASE of popery is confirmed by Wodrow, who says, "Affairs here are very dark, and every month darker. Our papists, highlanders, jacobites, and English-service men, are mightily aloft, and expecting great things in a few days, either from the queen's demise, which they long for, or a visit from their king; and we, on the other hand, are a poor, declining, broken, and spiritless people." In another letter, he says, "Papists were never so uppish . . . nor the priests so numerous these hundred years in Scotland as since our last peace. They reckon about eighty priests in and about Edinburgh. They are swarming in the north, and we have melancholy accounts from them of hundreds of protestant childred baptized by them, and multitudes confirmed. Masses are turned very open, and popish bishops baptize noblemen's children very openly²." Had they not been judicially blind, the presbyterians might have seen that the state of affairs just named was the natural result of their own intolerance and bigotry, that disgusted all sober people, and drove them into the arms of popery.

¹ Acts of Assembly, 491.

² Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 537-543.

CHAPTER LXII.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RIGHT REV. ALEXANDER ROSE, D.
VICAR-GENERAL OF THE PROVINCE OF ST. ANDREWS.

1714.—Proclamation of George I.—His arrival at Greenwich.—Change of ministry.—Chapel in Glasgow pulled down.—Mr. Cockburn.—James's declaration. Proclamation.—1715.—General Assembly—their memorial.—Case of scandal.—James and John Maitland.—Death of bishop Haliburton.—Earl Marr.—Progress of his enterprise.—Battle of Preston—of Sherrifmuir consequences.—The exiled prince lands at Peterhead—his declaration.—Leslie's letter.—1716.—Wodrow's statement.—Conduct of the presbyterians.—Marr's army disbanded.—Episcopalians persecuted—their conduct their sufferings in Aberdeen—and in that diocese.—Clergy imprisoned.—Form of abjuration required.—Copy of the indictments, note.—Conduct of clergy—Encroachment of the presbyteries on the civil jurisdiction.—Difficulty of procuring evidence.—Treatment of the witnesses.—The king's letter ordering chapels to be shut up.—Persecution of the clergy in Edinburgh.—Presbyterians suffer.—General suffering.—A prayer, note.—The Scottish prisoners sent to Carlisle.—The work of the presbyteries.—Mr. Dunbar—condemnation.—An Assembly.—Death of bishop Douglass.—Ill treatment the prisoners at Carlisle.—Bishop Nicolson.—Bishop Rose's son.—Bishop Douglass's son.—Commission of the kirk.—Oath of abjuration.—Bishop Rose deprived of his pension.—Clergy deprived of their churches.—Case of Mr. John Maitland—his letter to the sheriff.—Method of reading the presbyteries' sentences at the churches.—Conduct of the military.—1717.—Sufferings of the clergy.—State of the church of England.—Orders from the justices.—Mr. James Maitland's case.—The baptism of children by the clergy prohibited.—Synod—cite the clergy to the Court of Session—their sentences imprisoned.—Mr. Lunan of Daviot.—The clergy fined.—The Greek church.—An union proposed.—Points of difference.—An Assembly.—Socinian doctrines.—The king of Sweden.—1718.—Death of bishop Christie.—Consecration of bishops Millar and Irvine.—Oath of abjuration.—The prince Sobieski.—1719.—An act rejected to prevent the growth of schism.—Invasion from Spain threatened.—Rewards offered for the arrest of the duke of Ormond and others.—Spaniards land in Kintail.—Battle of Glen

—Act against the church.—1720.—A letter to bishop Rose—his death.—Reflections—on the clergy.—Patronage and toleration.—Affliction.—Rebellion.

1714.—UPON THE DEATH of the queen, George Lewis, elector of Hanover and great grandson of James I., was proclaimed king, by virtue of several acts of parliament for securing the protestant succession, with the usual formalities and at the ordinary places. The privy council assembled, when three instruments of the same tenor and date were produced by Dr. Tennison, archbishop of Canterbury, the lord chancellor, and by monsieur Kreynburgh, the Hanoverian resident, under the hand and seal of the elector of Hanover, now king George I., nominating nineteen persons to be added to the seven great officers who were appointed by act of parliament to compose the regency. King George was proclaimed at Edinburgh on the 5th, and at Dublin on the 11th of August. On the 14th the exiled prince left Lorraine and went to Versailles, but the French king refused to see him, pleading his engagements to the Hanover succession; when the unhappy exile returned despondingly to Lorraine. On the 24th, the late queen was privately interred in Westminster Abbey, in pursuance of orders from her successor. Orders were received from Hanover to prepare a patent for creating the prince royal prince of Wales, and for removing the lord Bolingbroke from his office of secretary of state. On the 31st the seals were taken from him, and the doors of his office locked and sealed. On the 15th September George issued a proclamation, offering a reward of £100,000 for apprehending his royal rival if he should land in any part of the British dominions. King George, with the prince his son, arrived at Greenwich on the 18th of September, and was received by lord chancellor Harcourt, at the head of the lords of the regency. On the following day the king held a court at Greenwich, “of all sorts; and it was observed, that those who prospered in the late reign met with a remarkable neglect; particularly, the lord Townsend was sent to tell the duke of Ormond, who came with uncommon splendour to pay his court to his majesty, that he had no further occasion for his services; whereupon the duke returned to St. James’s Square without being admitted to his majesty’s presence.” The earl of Oxford, the late lord treasurer, kissed his majesty’s hand “with the crowd,” but was not vouchsafed any farther notice. The lord chancellor Harcourt carried the prince’s patent to Greenwich, “but was turned out,” and not suffered to enjoy either the honour or the

profit of passing it ; and the Great Seal was given to the lord Cowper. The king made his public entry into London on the 20th, and on the 22d he declared in council his firm purpose to support and maintain the churches of England and Scotland as they were severally by law established. And king George was crowned at Westminster with the usual solemnities¹.

ON THE 6th or 7th of August, Mr. Cockburn's chapel in Glasgow was pulled down and entirely demolished, by the rabble of presbyterians, as Wodrow admits. He also has the effrontery to say, that " Mr. Cockburn tempted people to attack his meeting-house. Upon the day before the rabbling, he caused them to bring away his canonical gown, prayer-book, and bible, and that so publicly as it might be noticed and observed, and, as it were, *displenished his nest*, that people might be invited to take it down ; and that night took horse pretty late and left the place." He had received warning of this rabblement, and his congregation expected such a visitation. Wodrow adds, " I hear he hath represented that his family and house *were plundered*, and his furniture and books abused, and his wife insulted, which are abominable lies." It is more likely to be true than false, as such conduct was the custom of the times and of the people. Mr. Cockburn seems to have been the object of presbyterian hatred ; for Wodrow speaks of him with great bitterness². A precognition was taken on the 2d of September, when four or five score of witnesses were examined, but it was not convenient to punish any of the actors in this daring infraction of the law, and Mr. Cockburn got no redress. Mr. Wodrow complains, in almost every letter, of " the violent and illegal intrusions of episcopal intruders, and the English service into churches," which he ascribes to the union and to toleration. This might have satisfied him that the " inclination of the people " was a most fallacious foundation on which to build their establishment ; and that if the majority of the people had been left to their own choice, they would have still adhered to episcopacy.

AS SOON AS the exiled prince heard of his sister's death, he issued a declaration, under the style of James III., " to all kings, princes, and potentates ; and to every loving subject " he sent greeting, and said, " Every body knows that the revolution in the year 1688 ruined the English monarchy, and laid the foundation of a republican government by devolving the sovereign power on the people, who assembled themselves

¹ Salmon's Chronological Historian, ii. 38-48.

² Correspondence, i. 564-584.

without any authority, voted themselves a parliament, and assumed a right of deposing and electing kings contrary to the fundamental laws of the land, and the most express solemn oath that christians are capable of taking. . . . Besides that the elector of Brunswick is one of the remotest relations we have, and consequently one of the remotest pretenders to our crowns after us, it is evident that nothing is more opposite to the maxims of England, in all respects, than that unjust settlement of the succession upon his family. . . . Yet, contrary to our expectations, upon the death of the princess our sister (of whose good intentions towards us we could not for some time past well doubt, and this was the reason we then sat still, expecting the good effects thereof, which were unfortunately prevented by her deplorable death), we found that our people, instead of taking this favourable opportunity of retrieving the honour and true interest of their country by doing us and themselves justice, had immediately proclaimed for their king a foreign prince, to our prejudice, contrary to the fundamental and incontestible laws of hereditary right, which their pretended acts of parliament can never abrogate¹."

IN CONSEQUENCE of this Declaration, and some popular demonstrations at Oxford, and in several other places in England, in the royal exile's favour, the new government issued a proclamation for putting the laws in execution against papists, non-jurors, and disaffected persons. After George's accession, a total change commenced in every public station; all the late queen's ministers were either dismissed by express orders, or being treated with contempt, they resigned their places and withdrew. The two principal secretaries of state, Oxford and Bolingbroke, were impeached of high treason; and the earl of Marr was removed from the office of secretary for Scotland. In a word, says Mr. Skinner, "the public affairs throughout the whole kingdom put on a new face, under this foreign accession; and the new courtiers drove with such a high hand, as if their design had been, what was shrewdly suspected, to force on the commotions which soon happened²."

1715.—THE ASSEMBLY met on the 4th of May, the earl of Rothes commissioner, and principal Carstares was elected their moderator. After complimenting the ministers for their zeal for his succession, George assured them that he would inviolably maintain the kirk in all her rights and privileges.

¹ Culloden Papers, 30-32

² Ecclesiastical History, ii. 617, 18.—Salmon's Chron. Historian, ii. 44.

The attention of the Assembly was chiefly directed to the subject of patronage, and an act was passed “concerning the grievances of this church from *Toleration*, patronages, &c.,” to which was added, a memorial on the same subject, setting forth the grievances of which they complained. “The act granting such a large and almost boundless toleration to those of the episcopal persuasion in Scotland . . . this toleration doth not restrain the disseminating the most dangerous errors by requiring a confession of faith, or subscription to the doctrinal articles of the established church . . . it also weakeneth the discipline of the church against the scandalous and profane, by withdrawing the concurrence of the civil magistrate. . . . 2d. By the act restoring the power of presentation to patrons, the legally established constitution of this church was altered in a very important point¹.”

THE LOVE of power is inherent in the human breast, but it is most chiefly predominant in all bodies of men; hence the enmity that presbyterians have always expressed at patronage, the exercise of which, either by the crown or by educated men, has deprived the presbyteries of much of their supremacy. Dr. M'Crie, in his lamentations over its restoration, says,—“In fact, the large share of patronage possessed by the crown [all that which was formerly held by the bishops and ecclesiastical corporations] in Scotland, serves so far the same purpose as the supremacy which it enjoys in England does, while the partition of the remainder among other lay patrons adds an aristocratical to a regal lordship².” There was another act “discharging prelatical preachers to exercise church discipline.” This arose out of an attempt to maintain the dignity of the kirk, in a case in which a certain Elizabeth Salmon, a presbyterian, accused a Mr. M'Kenzie, an episcopalian, of being the father of a child of which she was the mother. The priest had dealt with Mr. M'Kenzie for this offence, and upon his repentance had received him again to communion; but the presbytery cited him to their bar, at which he declined to appear, disavowing their jurisdiction. The presbytery, therefore, brought this case to the General Assembly, and in consequence that body passed an act, “ordering the presbytery of Kirkcaldy to proceed against the said M'Kenzie, of Rossend, according to the rules of this church notwithstanding of any thing these prelatical preachers have done . . . and the Assembly discharges these prelatical preachers to proceed any farther in that matter, as *they will* &c.”

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 502.

² Testimony of Ass. Seced. p. 42.

*moveable*¹." In another act they order all presbyteries to send up the names of all episcopalian clergymen to the lord justice clerk, who intrude into parishes, churches, manses, or glebes, that they may be prosecuted.

THE PRESBYTERY of Turriff had suspended James Maitland, of the parish of Innerkeithnie, and his brother John, of Forgue, for not having observed their thanksgiving for the accession of King George. They were episcopal clergymen, who, like many others in the northern dioceses, still kept possession of their churches. They declined the jurisdiction of the presbytery; but the Assembly deposed them from the office of the ministry, and appointed their churches to be declared vacant. The chief cause for the persecution of these gentlemen was, that they had been presbyterian ministers; but both of them, upon full conviction, renounced the heresy, returned to the church, and received ordination from Dr. Haliburton, bishop of Aberdeen².

WHEN THE Fathers of the church were "exauctorated," they endeavoured to live in as great privacy as possible; and those who were possessed of property retired to it. This was the case with Dr. Haliburton, lord bishop of Aberdeen, who went to his estate at Denhead, near Cupar-in-Angus, where he resided for the space of twenty-six years. He died at Denhead on the 29th of September, in his 77th year³.

IN AUGUST after his dismissal, the earl of Marr retired from court in disgust, and went by sea to Newcastle, and thence to Scotland. He assembled on the 16th the marquisses of Huntly and Tullibardine; the earls of Nithsdale, Linlithgow, Traquair, Southesk, Marischall, and Carnwath; the viscounts Kilsyth, Kenmure, Kingston, and Stormont; and the lords Drummond, Rollo, &c., with whom he concerted measures for rising in favour of the exiled prince. On the 3d of September he assembled his forces at Aboyne, in Aberdeenshire, where he proclaimed James VIII. king, &c., and set up his standard on the 6th of the same month. On the 4th of October he had advanced to Perth, and was there joined by the Hon. James Murray. At this time his forces amounted to 5,000 men, and in a few days they had increased to the number of 10,000, when he sent forward a detachment of 4,000 men to take possession of Kirkcaldy, Kinghorn, and Bruntisland, with some

¹ Acts of Assembly, 505, 506.

² Representation, p. 66.—Tindal's History of England, ii. 20. Folio.

³ Keith's Catalogue, p. 134.

other places on the coast of Fife. On the 6th of October Mr Forster set up James's standard at Greuseg, in Northumberland, and assembled some troops; whereupon the government detached a body of troops to secure Newcastle. He took possession of Morpeth on the 10th, and was joined by about seventy Scottish gentlemen from the borders. On the 11th James Painter, Esq. of St. Columbe, in Cornwall, proclaimed James III. in that county; for whose apprehension a reward of £100 was offered. On the 14th the earl of Marr detached a body of Highlanders, under general Mackintosh, across the Forth, who took possession of Leith, but soon after abandoned it, and marched to Southwood. On the 19th the earl of Derwentwater, the viscount Kenmure, the earls of Nithsdale, Camrath, and Winton, joined Mr. Foster, at Morpeth, with about 200 horse, which they had raised in Nithsdale and the south of Scotland, when Mr. Foster, with his Northumbrians, marched northward, and joined Mackintosh at Dunse. Mr. Forster here opened his commission, empowering him to act as the general. This body was joined by several detachments of Scots, and took the route for Lancashire. At Appleby, Dr. Nicolson, bishop of Carlisle, opposed them at the head of the Cumberland and Westmoreland militia, who, however, immediately fled on the appearance of Mr. Forster's troops, whose numbers did not amount to 2,000 men, a body of 500 highlanders having deserted and dispersed, on the resolution to march into England. Forster reached Lancaster on the 6th of November: the militia having fled, he pushed on to Preston, which he entered on the 10th. General Willis, at the head of some regular troops, advanced from Manchester to attack him, and passed the Ribble bridge, about a mile from Preston, without any opposition. The neglect of defending this bridge was fatal, and to it may be ascribed the defeat and ruin of the enterprise; but although Mr. Forster bore the name of general, yet his men were under no command, and every gentleman expected his own opinion and advice should be followed. An action took place on the 12th of November, when Willis was repulsed, with the loss of 300 men; and it was not till he was joined by general Carpenter, with 800 horse, that he could prevail on his men to renew the attack. Lord Derwentwater and some others, without consulting their commander, offered to capitulate, thinking resistance in vain; but they obtained no better terms than to be made prisoners of war. The number of prisoners taken in Preston was about 1500, among whom was their commander Mr. Forster, the earl of Derwent-

lord Widdrington, the earls of Nithsdale, Winton, and Athol, viscount Kenmure, lord Nairn, about 72 English men, and 138 Scottish officers and gentlemen¹.

THE 13th of November, being the same day that Mr. Marr's enterprise was dissipated, the earl of Marr attacked the duke of Argyle on Sherrifmuir, close to Dunblane. The right wing of each army was beaten and fled; the right wings of both armies being victorious, pursued the other; neither could claim the victory, and neither army occupied the field of battle: Argyle retreated to Stirling, and Marr to Perth. The principal prisoners taken at Preston were pinioned at the city; the peers to the Tower, and the others to the Fleet, and the Marshalsea. To subject noble-people to the degradation of marching pinioned on foot like the malefactors, reflects no great credit on the magnanimity of the first prince of the House of Hanover. At this time the king was tendered to every person of respectability, and who refused them were committed to prison. Several of the commissioners of the peace were turned out of the commission for being so strict in imposing them as they were expected to be². The military bishop of Carlisle informs archbishop that the earl of Marr's expedition was broken, and that he entrenched himself and his highlanders at Perth, which he says, betokens confusion. "The devil seems to have taken these heroes [Marr and bishop Atterbury] in the end and they are now at (the last penny of their fortunes) the end. Our greatest danger, as we think, is from the force of the poor hungry highlanders, should they be shat-tered into parties (as 'tis ten thousand to one but they will follow) general Willis, and left to make the best of their way to the reckless cells in the braes of Athole. Some fancy, that they have heard how Mr. Carpenter has been diverted from following them, they'll immediately march back again (in a full force) through this county into Scotland, and there disperse³."

CHRISTMAS-DAY the exiled prince landed at Peterhead, his friends had been defeated. He had no troops with him, but only a few gentlemen and officers. The Declaration issued at his Court at Commercy the 25th of October, in the usual styles of the British kings at that time, had been circulated by his military representatives. Its language was affectionate and paternal, and he again alludes to his sis-

non's Chronological Historian, ii. 50-55.

² Salmon, ii. 56.

³ Ellis's Original Letters, iii. 361.

other places on the coast of Fife. On the 6th of October Forster set up James's standard at Greenseg, in Northumberland, and assembled some troops; whereupon the govern detached a body of troops to secure Newcastle. He took session of Morpeth on the 10th, and was joined by a seventy Scottish gentlemen from the borders. On the James Painter, Esq. of St. Columbe, in Cornwall, proclaimed James III. in that county; for whose apprehension a reward of £100 was offered. On the 14th the earl of Marr detached a body of Highlanders, under general Mackintosh, across Forth, who took possession of Leith, but soon after abandoned it, and marched to Southwood. On the 19th the earl of Wentwater, the viscount Kenmure, the earls of Nithsdale, Cathcart, and Winton, joined Mr. Foster, at Morpeth, with a 200 horse, which they had raised in Nithsdale and the south of Scotland, when Mr. Foster, with his Northumbrians, marched northward, and joined Mackintosh at Dunse. Mr. Forster opened his commission, empowering him to act as the general. This body was joined by several detachments of Scots, and took the route for Lancashire. At Appleby, Dr. Nicol, bishop of Carlisle, opposed them at the head of the Cumberland and Westmoreland militia, who, however, immediately on the appearance of Mr. Forster's troops, whose numbers did not amount to 2,000 men, a body of 500 highlanders having deserted and dispersed, on the resolution to march into England. Forster reached Lancaster on the 6th of November: the militia having fled, he pushed on to Preston, which he entered on the 10th. General Willis, at the head of some regular troops, advanced from Manchester to attack him, and passed the Ribble bridge, about a mile from Preston, without any success. The neglect of defending this bridge was fatal, and to it may be ascribed the defeat and ruin of the enterprise; but although Mr. Forster bore the name of general, yet his men were under no command, and every gentleman expressed his own opinion and advice should be followed. An action took place on the 12th of November, when Willis was repulsed, with the loss of 300 men; and it was not till he was joined by general Carpenter, with 800 horse, that he prevailed on his men to renew the attack. Lord Derwentwater and some others, without consulting their commander, offered to capitulate, thinking resistance in vain; but they obtained no better terms than to be made prisoners of war. The number of prisoners taken in Preston was about 1500, among whom was their commander Mr. Forster, the earl of Derwentwater.

water, lord Widdrington, the earls of Nithsdale, Winton, and Carnwath, viscount Kenmure, lord Nairn, about 72 English gentlemen, and 138 Scottish officers and gentlemen¹.

ON THE 13th of November, being the same day that Mr. Forster's enterprise was dissipated, the earl of Marr attacked the duke of Argyle on Sherrismuir, close to Dunblane. The left wing of each army was beaten and fled; the right wings of both armies being victorious, pursued the other; neither general could claim the victory, and neither army occupied the field of battle: Argyle retreated to Stirling, and Marr to Perth. The principal prisoners taken at Preston were pinioned at Barnet, and all of them, *peers* and all, marched in that state through the city; the peers to the Tower, and the others to Newgate, the Fleet, and the Marshalsea. To subject noblemen to the degradation of marching pinioned on foot like the worst of malefactors, reflects no great credit on the magnanimity of the first prince of the House of Hanover. At this time the oaths were tendered to every person of respectability, and those who refused them were committed to prison. Several justices of the peace were turned out of the commission for not being so strict in imposing them as they were expected to have been². The military bishop of Carlisle informs archbishop Wake, that the earl of Marr's expedition was broken, and that he had entrenched himself and his highlanders at Perth, which shift, he says, betokens confusion. "The devil seems to have left both these heroes [Marr and bishop Atterbury] in the lurch, and they are now at (the last penny of their fortunes) their wit's end. Our greatest danger, as we think, is from the return of the poor hungry highlanders, should they be shattered into parties (as 'tis ten thousand to one but they will be) by general Willis, and left to make the best of their way to their reckless cells in the braes of Athole. Some fancy, that having heard how Mr. Carpenter has been diverted from following them, they'll immediately march back again (in a full body) through this county into Scotland, and there disperse³."

ON CHRISTMAS-DAY the exiled prince landed at Peterhead, after all his friends had been defeated. He had no troops with him, but only a few gentlemen and officers. The Declaration, dated at his Court at Commercy the 25th of October, under the usual styles of the British kings at that time, had been circulated by his military representatives. Its language is affectionate and paternal, and he again alludes to his sis-

¹ Salmon's Chronological Historian, ii. 50-55.

² Salmon, ii. 56.

³ Ellis's Original Letters, iii. 361.

ter's intention, had she lived, of working out his restoration. He concludes with saying,—“ We do by these presents absolutely and effectually for us, our heirs and successors, pardon, remit, and discharge all crimes of high treason, misprision of treason, and all other crimes and offences whatsoever, done or committed against us or our royal father, of blessed memory, by any of our subjects, of what degree or quality soever, which shall at and after our landing, and before they engage in any action against us or our forces, from that time lay hold of our mercy, and return to that duty and allegiance which they owe to us, their only rightful and lawful sovereign¹.” But, if we can believe Wodrow, the prince was as bigotted as his father had been; for he says,—“ When he came he was so firm in his education, that he would not so much as engage to preserve the protestant religion by oath when they were coming to crown him. By no means would he be prevailed upon to be an occasional conformist, or to be present at the English service, which was set up by all of the tolerated, and plainly told he would not disoblige his friends abroad².”

DR. LESLIE, the famous non-juror, had gone over, the previous year, to Bar-le-duc, where the prince then held his Court, and wrote a letter to a member of parliament, which was printed and extensively circulated. When the prince landed at Pevensey head, all he could do was to circulate this letter, from which I shall extract that part that relates to religion:—“ As to the chief objection that remains—the difference of religion—his majesty hopes that all good men will consider that he was driven out of his own country in the cradle, and that everybody's education being the choice and business of their parents, he was educated by his parents in that religion, and in that church, they themselves thought to be the best; and since he has thus been educated, and has never seen any other church, if he should declare himself a protestant, a few of his friends would believe him, and his enemies would be sure to turn it against him; not only as a mean and dishonourable, but a dangerous dissimulation. It is not possible for him, in his present circumstances, to enter into disputes on matters of religion; and public and formal disputes are rarely attended with any real advantages. But as soon as it pleases God to give him the full and free opportunity of conversation with his people, he promises, upon his honour, that he will fairly hear and examine whatever any good man, churchman or layman, shall think fit to represent to him in these matters.

¹ Old Book of Manuscripts.

² Wodrow's Correspondence, ii. 156

and whatever shall be the result as to his private opinion, his administration shall be according to the laws and constitutions, without giving the least ground of offence, or making the least encroachments.

“The church of England has reason to be assured of his particular favour as well as his protection, considering the early assurances he gave in his instructions, bearing date March 3, 1708, to which he adheres, and will faithfully make them good. He thinks the interest of the church of England and that of the crown to be the same. They have always stood and fallen together; and the one is always struck at through the other. Her former loyalty has justly shined in the esteem of the world, and her principles ought not to be reproached for the faults of those who have, unhappily, departed from them in their practices.

“AND BECAUSE the greatest hurt any king of England can do the church is to put bad bishops upon her, this being to corrupt the fountain; therefore, to avoid all jealousies, he was willing, during his reign, so far to wave his prerogative in the nomination of bishops, deans, and all other ecclesiastical preferments in the gift of the crown, that five bishops shall be appointed, of which the archbishop of Canterbury for the time being always to be one, who, upon any vacancy, might *name three persons to him, of whom he would choose one.* . . . That he had informed himself of past miscarriages, and knew well the difference between the office of a KING and a MISSIONARY, and therefore he would concern himself with no man's religion, but was resolved to defend that which was legally established, and whose principles are true to monarchy, and safe for government. That, as an instance of his good intentions, he had sent for Mr. Leslie, to officiate to the protestants in his family, had caused a room to be fitted up in his house as a chapel for them, and had taken out of their congregation his present secretary of state. That the avowed doctrine of the illustrious House of Hanover is CONSUBSTANTIATION, which is *as erroneous and as contrary* to the doctrine of the church of England as TRANSUBSTANTIATION: and yet no provision had been made, that when they come into Great Britain, they should be of the communion of the church of England¹.”

1716.—WODROW gives a very melancholy account of affairs at this time; and it is evident that the government were perfectly unprepared for the present enterprise; and had the

¹ Old Book of MSS.—Boyer's Life of Queen Anne, 698.

chiefs acted in concert, and with common military prudence they might have shook king George's throne. The presbyterians have endeavoured to fasten the whole of this enterprise on the episcopal church, as a church; whereas the government of the church did not interfere in any way, and Marr's army was composed of both episcopalians and presbyterians, both of whom thought they were fighting for their lawful sovereign. Wodrow ventures to say, "that the whole liturgy men in Scotland, I think almost without exception, are joined with Marr, and the most part of those who are prelatically inclined, are none but such, with the papists, are in his army. For as far as I can learn, there is not one who ever was reckoned a presbyterian who is with him¹." In the latter point he is quite mistaken; there were many presbyterians who had a just idea of the right of primogeniture as episcopalians could have; indeed, it is a principle implanted in the heart of man by his Creator, and, like other fundamental principles, will never be eradicated. That there were episcopalians in Marr's army is certain; and the author already cited says—

"AS FOR THE STATE of the country when the earl of Marr made his appearance; that he might the *more readily gain* such as in former times had been under hatches, declared it was his design to restore to Scotland its *ancient* constitution in church and state, and to give all encouragement to the liturgy, which was the only public worship in his camp. All things were then carried on in the name of him whom he had caused to be proclaimed king, in almost all the towns beneath Forth. All officers, civil and military, acted in his name; levies were made, cess imposed and exacted; orders and proclamations were read and published at market-crosses and in churches; even presbyterians generally found themselves obliged to show very respectful behaviour to the prevailing power, both in their speeches and deportment. The word *King* was used instead of *Pretender*, at least in their public conversations; for the people are most careful observers of the natural law of self-preservation. His orders and proclamations were read in some of their churches, the teachers making no remonstrance against it, nor forbidding their clerks to read them. Some of them gave under their hands receipts of proclamations, and in the public prayers *left off the name of king George*, and contented themselves with saying the *rightful sovereign*. Now, all this being duly weighed in an unbiassed judgment, it may seem a very unaccountable procedure in the presbyterian judicatories

¹ Correspondence, ii. 92.

to have raised such a dreadful persecution for some small compliances, which could have no dangerous influence on any government, though all that was alleged had been true, as certainly much of it was false. Let them lay their hands on their hearts, and they must acknowledge that in judging others they have condemned themselves; they must own that the clergy behaved themselves with greater temper and moderation than they would have done, had they been in their circumstances. Let them only but remember their own behaviour in the reigns of king Charles I. and Charles II., and then they will see, that of all men it was most unbecoming in them, to prosecute their brethren for alleged treasonable compliances, while several, who justly underwent the punishment of open and avowed rebellion, maintain an honourable place in the martyrologies of their kirk as sufferers for presbytery, as (in their dialect) the *good old Cause*. He knows little of the men or of the history of that party, who is not convinced that the true cause of the present persecution is their inveterate enmity against episcopacy and the liturgy, which they well know could never succeed without rendering the clergy suspected to the civil government; they must, therefore, at any rate be brought in guilty of seditious and treasonable practices. The mighty topics, so much insisted on at the beginning of the Revolution, that ‘protection and allegiance are reciprocal duties;’ that ‘whosoever has power enough to awe my allegiance, makes it thereby become due to him,’ must have no force now, though it was then an enlightening argument. So far were the presbyteries from allowing any extenuating circumstances in the case of the clergy, that the most inconsiderable *seeming* compliances were strained to prodigious inferences, and these strained inferences were made the chief ground of their sentence of deposition. For instance, the preaching on a week-day (for this was all the compliances made by some, or proved against them), was reckoned a design to extirpate the protestant religion and destroy the professors thereof. All this, and much more, will plainly appear from the following narrative, which is confined to their proceedings in the diocese and shire of Aberdeen, though their violence was equal in other places¹.”

TOWARDS THE END of January, Argyle having been reinforced, advanced towards Perth, and Marr retreated northward to Aberdeen, and being pursued by Argyle as far as to that city,

¹ Representation of the State of the Church in North Britain, 22-25.

cuted by the presbyterian judicatories, with equal if not greater violence, than others who were not so qualified¹."

MR. DUMBRECK had been very instrumental in promoting the use of the liturgy; and, dreading the coming storm, he found it necessary to leave Aberdeen, and conceal himself among his friends, to avoid the persecution which had now commenced. Dr. George Garden had more resolution, and remained at his post. He was arrested and thrown into prison, and lay there for five months, when he contrived to make his escape abroad into a foreign country. Dr. Burnet, and Mr. Blair, curate to his father, dare not appear in public; and Dr. James Gordon, under the infirmities of old age, was obliged to leave the town and wander about from place to place. "Thus was that regular congregation (composed of the best and most intelligent burghers and people of the town) deprived of the regular worship of God, and of their rightful and lawful pastors. It will no doubt be here alleged, that they brought this upon themselves by their disaffection to the civil government. But if so, what, then, was the reason of that strong and illegal opposition which they made to a certain clergyman of the church of England, very well affected to the civil government, and every way qualified, who only officiated in a private house to a handful of people, who were now deprived of their lawful pastor? Or why did they influence the justices of the peace (contrary to law) to refuse to cause his letters of holy orders to be registered when required thereto under due form of an instrument? Why did they, also, persecute and threaten such as heard him, so qualified according to law to preach in private families, and banished two of them the town—to wit, William Oliphant and John Andrew, for assembling once or twice with the said Mr. Garden?" About the year 1698, the presbytery deposed this Mr. Garden for having preached anti-presbyterian doctrines; and their proceedings against him had been very arbitrary and unfair. But under whatsoever pretence they might pretend to prosecute the clergy, the real cause of their enmity was episcopacy and the liturgy. If presbyterian deposition had been sufficient to render a clergyman incapable of the benefit of law, or to exercise the ministerial function, how easy might it have been for them to have extirpated episcopacy from Great Britain!²

MR. BARCLAY at Old Aberdeen, and his brother at Peterhead, Mr. Moore at Frasersburgh, Mr. Keith at Ellon, and

¹ Representation of the State of the Church, &c. 20-22.

² Ibid. 27.

Mr. Livingston at Old Deer, were forced away from their churches. A party of soldiers was sent to Mr. Livingston's manse to apprehend him; but missing him, the soldiers plundered his house, and took away his wife and child's clothes, although this gentleman had a protection from the English general. Mr. Craig, an aged clergyman, who used the liturgy, was arrested in his own house at Frasersburgh. When he was brought before the commander of the military party, that officer expressed his astonishment at the malice of the presbyterians—"What would the government do with this old man? he is not able to carry arms; the doctor cannot kill a mouse." All the private chapels, where the liturgy had been used, were suddenly shut up by military violence, without any process or form of law; "and the good christian people left as a prey to heretics, schismatics, enthusiasts, and all manner of seducing teachers; to the very great scandal of religion in general, and of the protestant name in particular¹."

HAVING IN this manner suppressed and scattered the episcopal chapels, in all of which the liturgy was used, the presbyterians next attacked the clergy who still had possession of the parish churches, by sending parties of soldiers to apprehend them. Mr. Robertson, of Strathdon, and Mr. Alexander, at Kildrimmey, were arrested and carried prisoners to Aberdeen, and, with Dr. George Garden, were sent to Edinburgh. On the road they were treated without the least regard to their sacred character, particularly at Cupar, where they were thrust into the filthy dungeon where the greatest criminals were kept. They were kept six months in the gaol at Edinburgh, and set at liberty on bail. Mr. Strachan, of Glenkindie, was sent through the county of Aberdeen, with a party of dragoons, to deprive all the episcopal clergy, and to imprison them if they ventured to remain in their manse. He summoned MR. DUNBAR at Cruden, Mr. Robertson at Longside, and Mr. Hepburn at St. Fergus, to Peterhead; where he acquainted them with the orders he had received from the presbyteries, and advised them to give up their churches in order to prevent imprisonment. He was, however, prevailed on to suspend his proceedings for a little, and wait the result of the processes that the presbytery of Aberdeen had already commenced. The presbyteries would gladly have saved themselves the trouble and odium of prosecuting the clergy, and they now tried another method of deprivation. They sent delegates of their own number to endeavour to per-

¹ Representation, 28.

suade the clergy to lay aside the whole exercise of their sacred functions, and thereby to save themselves from prosecution for in the event of their being found guilty, it might be followed by a criminal charge before a civil judge. To avoid this danger, the presbyterian deputation, who coveted possession of their churches, advised them to give in a dimission of their churches to the presbytery of the bounds, containing an obligation to abstain from exercising any part of their ministerial functions. The following is a copy of this remarkable obligation that was required of the clergy :—

“ I, A. B., BEING INFORMED that the synod of Aberdeen met at Aberdeen the —— day of April, 1716, did peremptorily appoint the several presbyteries within their bounds to call and cite before them the several episcopal ministers and preachers, in order to inquire into and censure them, as they should see cause, for their behaviour in the time of the late confusion ; and considering that I was compelled to some piece of conduct in the said late time which might probably expose me to the cognizance of the presbytery of ——, and I having inclination to live privately and peaceably, therefore do hereby solemnly engage, promise, and oblige myself, that I shall not preach nor exercise any part of the ministry in any place within the bounds of the presbytery of ——, or synod of Aberdeen, so long as the Lord, in his holy and wise providence, shall continue the legal establishment of the presbyterian government within this part of the kingdom of Great Britain called Scotland. And to this I hereby oblige myself under pain of any censure the said presbytery of ——, or synod of Aberdeen, shall think I deserve, in case I contravene or break my above engagement. In witness whereof these presents are written and subscribed, &c.¹”

THE CLERGY rejected these unchristian and unjust demands with indignation. Mr. Moore in particular gave his reasons in writing why he could not comply with their demands ; but they refused to admit his reasonings, and libelled him, not only for that one instance, but for many atrocious crimes of which they well knew he was perfectly innocent. Having failed in these attempts, they next made false charges of high treason against them, in order to conceal the unchristian method they were now using to work the ruin of episcopacy and the liturgy. The clergy were summoned to answer for high treason

¹ Representation, 78, 79.

and in general they never mentioned either the liturgy or episcopacy, except the presbytery of Ellon, which, to their other pretended crimes, added the use of "the English liturgy and ceremonies." The moderator of the presbytery of Ellon assured Mr. Dunbar, of Cruden, by order of the presbytery, "that his introducing the said liturgy and ceremonies into his church was the main cause of his prosecution before them¹."

AFTER RECEIVING these summonses, the clergy were divided in their opinions respecting their appearance before presbyterian judicatories. It was not altogether safe for some of them, especially those of Aberdeen, to appear; others considered they owed no obedience to presbyteries, as they were of ano-

¹ Representation, &c. 32. THE FOLLOWING is a copy of these libels or indictments :—"The presbytery of _____ taking into consideration that _____ having been incumbent in the church of _____ at the late happy Revolution did pretend to have taken the oaths to the civil government, and subscribe the Assurance, &c., did continue to exercise the office of the holy ministry there under the protection of law. Yet nevertheless, it is alleged that the said _____ has engaged himself in the late unnatural and unjust rebellion against our gracious and only lawful and rightful sovereign, king George, in order to dethrone his majesty, and overturn and destroy the protestant succession in his royal family, and to establish a popish pretender on the throne of these realms, to the utter subversion of the true protestant religion with our laws and liberties. And did upon the twenty and fourth day of November last, or one or other of the days of the said month, keep a public fast for the success of the arms of the pretender, praying for him under the name and title of king James VIII.; or on one or other of the days of the month of September, October, November, December, January, or February last, publicly in the said church; and kept a thanksgiving upon the second day of February last, or on one or other of the days of the said month, for the safe arrival of the said Pretender in Scotland. The sabbath preceding having read his proclamation for the said end, as also read, or suffered to be read, from the pulpit of the said church, divers proclamations or orders emitted by the Pretender's authority, for paying cess and contributions to him, and levying men for his service; casting off all allegiance to our only lawful and rightful sovereign, king George; neglecting to pray for his majesty, as required by authority both civil and ecclesiastic. By all which the said _____ has deserted the protestant cause, and espoused the interest of a popish pretender, contrary to his oath, duty, and the obligations he is under, and is guilty of a very atrocious scandal, and is art and part of that most wicked design and contrivance that has been formed and carrying on for extirpating the true protestant religion, and destroying its professors, and to overturn the present happy establishment in the land; and instead thereof to settle popery and arbitrary power among us. Therefore the presbytery appoints John Smith, &c., their officer, to pass and lawfully summon the said _____ personally, or at his dwelling-house, upon ten free days, to compare before them at _____ upon the eighth day of May next, to answer to the premises, and to hear and see the same sufficiently proven and verified; and being proven and verified, to hear and see sentence pass against him, censuring him as the said presbytery shall judge he deserves, with certification if he fail to appear, they will proceed according to the form of process, and appoints a true copy hereof, and of the list of witnesses, to be delivered to the said _____, or at his dwelling-place, in due form. This, by the order of the presbytery, is given at the kirk of _____, this nineteenth day of April, in the year one thousand seven hundred and sixteen, and subscribed by, &c."

ther communion ; and others, seeing the presbyterian ministers were so elated with the present favourable juncture in their affairs, and expecting neither justice nor mercy from them, neglected their citations, and let them take their full swing. “ They doubted not but the presbyteries would have condemned even St. Paul himself, had he lived among them, and had owned that divine order which he planted in the infancy of the church.” Some, however, resolved to appear, not because they acknowledged the jurisdiction of the presbytery, but for the purpose of declining it, and to remonstrate against their arbitrary proceedings, and likewise to prevent, if possible, their bullying the witnesses, and imposing on their simplicity. “ For these and the like reasons, they appeared either personally or by proxy, and gave in a *declinature*, as the term in law is, which they required under form of instrument might be openly read and recorded in the presbytery books. The declinatures consisted chiefly of three heads. The first was, the disclaiming the presbytery’s jurisdiction over them, as being of a different communion, and who by their own principles could not acknowledge any ecclesiastical jurisdiction independent of a bishop. Such as were qualified, further added, that they were still under the protection of the government, and by several acts of parliament were exempted from presbyterian jurisdiction. A second head was, the *incompetency* of the presbytery to judge the matters libelled, as being only cognoscible by the *civil magistrate*. Thirdly, it was therein declared, that they could not censure the *scandal* till the *crimes* were first proved ; and this could not be legally done but before a *secular* judge. Lastly, several in the close protested, that their being present at the examination of witnesses was no acknowledgment of their authority, but only to see themselves and witnesses fairly dealt with : the rest that followed was but matter of common form¹.”

THERE were two circumstances in the proceedings of the presbyteries that excited considerable astonishment. The first was their ambition and audacity in assuming authority to indict the clergy, and to examine witnesses upon charges of high treason ; a crime which no ecclesiastical court whatever is competent to try. This encroachment on the province of the civil power was as substantial at this time as it had been in the days of Andrew Melville, who first made the attempt. The persecuted clergy were not members of their society, nor as clergymen were they subject to their jurisdiction.

¹ Representation, 33, 34.

The presbyteries made themselves parties, whilst at the same time they assumed the right of judges; hence episcopacy and the liturgy were more insufferable crimes in their eyes than sedition and rebellion. "Without regard to their intrinsic power, they formerly prosecuted such as were not protected by the law before the secular judges, and that for causes which might have come under the cognizance of an ecclesiastical court. But now they feared that most of the clergy might have been absolved of all guilt, had they prosecuted them before an impartial and disinterested court, where all the merits of the cause are judiciously pondered and the sentences founded on known laws, and thus their design had been disappointed. To prevent this, they judge them in their own courts, where, having the management of the whole process and witnesses in their own hands, and being, contrary to all law and equity, *accuser, judge, and jury*, they are sure to bring them in guilty." The other circumstance that created surprise, was their charging the clergy with a desertion of the protestant interest, and of a design to extirpate the protestant religion. Their more sober friends were ashamed of this mendacious assertion; but it was only consistent with their designs and principles, for they consider episcopacy and the liturgy as popery, and presbyterians to be the only true protestants. "But supposing that some of the clergy might have prayed for the Pretender, subscribed an address to him, and kept a thanksgiving for his safe arrival; what did they more than the presbyterians swore was the confession of their own faith, that 'infidelity or *difference* of religion does *not* make void the magistrates' just and legal authority, nor free the people from the obedience due to him?' Or did all the presbyterian teachers turn papists when they prayed for and made a most flattering address to the Pretender's father, and thanked him for a toleration, which thinking men feared would prove, as it was intended, an open door for popery? There was a third circumstance that surprised men, which was, that many of the presbyterian ministers had taken the oath of abjuration, which the non-jurors among them understood to be a solemn obligation to submit to no sovereign but to one who is of the communion of the church of England, and who maintains her polity and form of worship. The present persecution against the clergy and the liturgy of that communion, was most inconsistent with this oath; but let them, if they can, reconcile it with the abjuration, or that oath with their covenant¹."

¹ Representation, 41-43.

THE PRESBYTERIES paid no regard to the declinatures, nor offered any answers to the weighty reasons contained in them, but sustained themselves judges, and proceeded to examine such witnesses as made their appearance. They found it very difficult to bring up witnesses, as the people were so attached to their episcopal clergy that they considered it the greatest hardship to be compelled to give evidence, and they refused to come forward, especially when they saw their professed enemies were their judges, when the purest innocence could not escape deposition. In this dilemma the presbyterians followed the popish example, and applied to the secular power, when the justices of the peace granted their warrants to cite witnesses to answer to such interrogatories as should be put to them. Many of the witnesses cited still refused to appear, and others who did, declined the jurisdiction of the presbyteries, and did not depone. The next step was to send delegates to the quarter sessions, then met at Ellon, and to importune them to compel witnesses to give their depositions; and the justices issued an act ordering witnesses to appear at the presbyteries, and to answer to interrogatories, under a penalty of an hundred merks. This was a stretch beyond their powers, for no justice had authority to exact more than fifteen merks from a witness; and an act of the British parliament prohibited all civil magistrates to force any person to appear when summoned before the presbyteries. "Having, then, by the aforesaid arts, got the witnesses to appear and depone, an honest heart will not easily believe the unchristian, illegal, and tricking methods which were used in examining them; their interrogatories were couched in ambiguous and ensnaring terms, and when they found a witness to practise upon by reason of his gross ignorance, they made it their business to tease him with a multitude of entangling questions, in order to confound him. What made for the party was smothered and suppressed, and the words, too, of the witnesses were often changed for others, differing in sense and meaning, for which reason several of them refused to subscribe their deposition so adulterated; upon which, therefore, the clerk of the presbytery flatly told them the minutes were already filled up, and if they would not subscribe them as they were, they must expect to have the sentences of the justices executed upon them with the utmost severity. Some even of their own number, more modest than the rest, blushed at this unconscionable behaviour of their brethren. It was usual, moreover, with them to examine the evidence in the absence of the party accused, and even when he was under no citation from the presbytery,

as in the case of Mr. Moore and Mr. Idol, at Coul, to whom this notable injustice was done; the clerk having inserted in the minutes, as a part of the deposition, words which the witness had not at all spoken. This was challenged by the witness when his deposition was read to him; but finding no redress, he turned to his fellow witnesses, and said, ‘Cursed is he who adds or alters what men depone upon.’ The witnesses against the pastors of the episcopal congregation especially, and particularly against the clergy of Aberdeen, who were not in safety to appear, were all examined in absence, and that upon a first or second citation, without waiting a *third*, as the rules of their own discipline positively require¹.”

THE WITNESSES against Mr. Innes, of Gemrie, were examined in his absence, on the first citation. A man was examined against Mr. Moore, in his absence, who deposed upon oath of things spoken by Mr. Moore from the pulpit more than six months before, and enlarged his deposition so as to fill a sheet of paper, not in Mr. Moore’s words, but in what he *thought* was their meaning; and he added, that Mr. Moore enlarged much more to the same purpose in the afternoon. This would have invalidated his testimony before any other court, for Mr. Moore had *no afternoon service*; but here it was sustained as conclusive evidence. By examining witnesses in the absence of the accused parties, the presbyterians carried all before them without opposition, and the clergy were thereby prevented from excepting to their enemies or to incompetent evidence. The Aberdeenshire clergy were not alone the sufferers in this presbyterian inquisition. The Rev. Daniel Taylor, and twenty-four other episcopal clergymen in Edinburgh; ARTHUR MILLAR, in Leith, Robert Colt and James Hunter, Musselburgh, were imprisoned for having officiated in their several chapels without letters of orders from a protestant bishop—meaning an English or Irish prelate—and without having prayed for king George.

HIS MAJESTY wrote a letter on the 21st of May, to the lords of justiciary, stating that he understood that there were meeting-houses in Edinburgh and other parts of Scotland, where divine service was performed without praying for himself and his royal family; and requiring their lordships to give strict orders for shutting up all such meeting-houses, and for proceeding against offenders in time coming. The judges sent an answer to secretary Stanhope, representing their alacrity in ordering prosecutions against such offenders; but as to shut-

¹ Representation, 45-47.

ting up their meeting-houses, they observed, "we are humble of opinion that our forms do not allow such summary procedure till after trial and conviction by due course of law. But even then, their lordships suspected they were only authorised to exact the penalties prescribed by law, but not shut up the meeting-houses; at same time, however, they ordered the crown lawyers to prepare indictments immediately against all the episcopal clergy who were guilty of this offence. The prisoners before named were accordingly served with an indictment, setting forth that a statute of queen Anne was enacted for preventing disturbance to those of the episcopal communion in Scotland; that this statute especially provided that no person should presume to officiate as a pastor in such congregations without having previously lodged with the justices of the peace letters of orders from a protestant bishop, and without also praying in express words for king George, &c. That, nevertheless, the prisoners had presumed to celebrate the episcopal worship without such letters of orders, which was contrary to the establishment of the church of Scotland, as settled by act of parliament and ratified by the act of Union; that they had also neglected to pray for king George; for which transgressions the prisoners ought to be punished in terms of the act¹.

THE PRISONERS confessed both charges; one of which was that they had not been ordained by an English or an Irish bishop. One of them produced letters of orders from an ex-auctorated Scottish bishop; but all the others were debarred from preaching till they should produce letters of orders in terms of the act. Twenty-one of them were also fined £20 each; one-half to the informer, and the other half to the parochial poor: "a sentence," says Arnott, "*palpably illegal*, for as this penal statute annexed the penalty of £20 to the not praying for queen Anne *while living*, it was repugnant to every rule of law, to every principle of liberty, to extend the penalty to the not praying for king George *after she was dead*. As the Court had omitted to grant letters of horning, his majesty's advocate, about six months afterwards, prayed the Court for letters of horning, seeing *no informer would apply*, and they were granted accordingly for £10 against each of these persons, to be paid to his lordship as informer. About the same time a petition was presented to the Court by the magistrates of Edinburgh, setting forth that their lordships, by their sentence of the 28th of June, had commanded all sheriffs

¹ Arnott's Criminal Trials, 343.

and magistrates of burghs to prevent those clergymen from officiating within their districts; that, however, they had now produced their orders, which were registered as the statute directed; that the lord-advocate had delivered a message to the magistrates, from his royal highness the regent, signifying his opinion, that they had been remiss in executing the sentence of justiciary, and his expectation that they would pay more zealous attention to carry it into execution. And the magistrates being at a loss how to proceed in respect of the letter of orders being produced, craved the directions of the Court. Their lordships returned an answer dark and equivocal as the Sibylline oracles; importing, that the process was ended, and that they could not alter their own sentence; 'and the said lords looked on the said sentence as containing a full warrant for the execution of the same.' I apprehend that the lords of justiciary and the magistrates of Edinburgh had reciprocally endeavoured to devolve on each other the *odium* of the people for executing the sentence, or the *indignation* of the prince for not executing it. It appears that the shutting up of episcopal meeting-houses was by no means rigorously enforced, for I find several of these very clergymen, within a few months, *again convicted* for the said offence. Indeed, the criminal records, for several years after this, are in a manner *engrossed with prosecutions against episcopal non-jurors*¹."

THE EPISCOPAL CLERGY were not alone the sufferers in this inquisition; for Wodrow informs us, that in the midland counties all the precentors, that is, the Amen-clerks in the kirks, joined lord Marr's army. In consequence the presbyteries were chiefly occupied with prosecuting them also for high treason; those who appeared at the Courts were sentenced by the moderators "to make an acknowledgment of their fall before the congregation; those who had been more active, and had read lord Marr's proclamations, were deprived of their office. They also "took order" with the people who had joined the enterprise; but they being more numerous, got off more easily. The presbytery of Brechin deposed one of their own brethren for having prayed for the Pretender, and taking part in his army; and also an episcopal clergyman. "They have likewise deposed several jacobite schoolmasters, and our presbytery [of the Mearns] have deposed one of the latter, and will give some more the same fate²."

¹ Arnott's Criminal Trials, 343-346; cited in Episcopal Magazine for November, 1828, p. 346. Mr. Arnott was himself an "episcopal non-juror."

² Wodrow's Correspondence, ii. 124.

THE SEVERITY of the government, in imprisoning, transporting, and executing so many of the nobility and gentry who had been *out* in the late enterprise, brought mourning and desolation into many families. “Many worthy fellows that were out” acted from a high sense of honour and of duty to him whom they considered their natural sovereign, and the new dynasty would have much sooner conciliated the affections of the people than they did, had a more generous and magnanimous policy been pursued at that time. To console the afflicted families, and to avert the imminent danger with which their friends were threatened, bishop Rose composed a “prayer for the afflicted in this time of calamity, for prisoners and for those who are condemned to die.” He enjoined it to be said by all the clergy in the course of the forenoon service¹.

¹ “O eternal God! who in Thy righteous judgment hath covered many among us with a cloud in the day of thine anger, and hast broken them sore as in the place of dragons, look down upon them, we earnestly pray thee, with an eye of tender compassion and pity. Let them know that affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground, and that there is no evil in the city which the Lord hath not done: that so they may with a perfect resignation submit to the will of God without any murmuring thought against Him, or having their spirits in the least embittered against the providential instruments of their present calamities. O Lord, direct them in their difficulties, comfort them under their sadness, support them in temptation, provide for them in all their wants, secure them in the midst of dangers, and cover them under the shadow of Thy Wings, until these calamities be overpast.

“And thou, O God! who hast shewed them great and sore troubles, quicken them again; bring them up from the depths of the earth, and comfort them on every side. What time their hearts are overwhelmed within them, Lord lead them to the Rock that is higher than they; and in the multitude of their disquieting thoughts, let thy comforts delight their souls. Give to them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; turn their weeping into joy; put off their sackcloth and gird them with gladness, to the end their glory may sing to Thee and not be silent, and that they may give thanks to Thee for ever. Enrich them with the graces of thy Holy Spirit, and more especially with faith, patience, and charity; and so sanctify to them all their afflictions, that however grievous they may be to them for the present, they may work in them the peaceable fruits of righteousness in this life, and for them in the next an eternal weight of glory. And now, O most merciful Father, we most earnestly pray Thee that Thou wouldest set the dispersed and solitary in families again: bring them forth that are bound in chains—proclaim an acceptable year and liberty to the captives: let the sorrowful sighing of the prisoners come before Thee; and according to the greatness of Thy Power, preserve Thou those that are appointed to die. And if, in thy sovereign providence, Thou thinkest fit to give way to the execution of the sentence of death against them, we most earnestly pray Thee, they may every way be enabled thoroughly to leave this naughty and miserable world: make them truly penitent for all their sins, and absolve them from the guilt of them. May their souls be washed in the blood of their Redeemer, and so presented unto Thee without spot or blemish. Mix, we pray Thee, much comfort with their bitter cup: fortify them against the fear of death by the hope of Thy mercy, of a joyful resurrection from the dead, and of everlasting life after death; and, O good God, preserve them by thy power through faith unto salvation.

Do good in Thy good pleasure unto Sion: build Thou the walls of Jerusalem,

late prisoners in Edinburgh Castle, to the number of nine, were sent to Carlisle, to be tried, of whom five received sentence of death; the others were discharged.

The distress of those who had been recently in arms has been very great. Wodrow says,—“The heads are all off the country. Some of the lesser gentlemen skulking in disguise in beggars’ habits; some with wands, as weavers; some with elwands and packs, and

The common people were at first averse to the rebellion but when once their heads were in, like one man they and the skulkers keep up the disaffection¹.”

Mr WODROW’S correspondents inform him, that the Synod of Laurencekirk had ordered the episcopal clergy in that district to be summoned, and they “are purposed to bring them upon evidence of their rebellion, which will be soon proven. And I find this is the method which other Synods are taking, *to ease this corner for ever of the rebels*.”

Again, a Mr. Trail informs Wodrow, that twenty-one prisoners had passed through Laurencekirk, among whom George Garden, and several episcopal clergymen.

The PRESBYTERY of Ellon transferred their sitting sixteen miles beyond their own bounds, to St. Nicholas’s church, Aberdeen, and summoned Mr. Dunbar from Cruden to attend court. He protested against their sitting to judge him where they had no jurisdiction, being the seat of the Synod of Aberdeen, and beyond the bounds of their jurisdiction. He objected to the witnesses; but he could not prevent the hearing; and all he could do was to protest against the proceedings, and leave the court. A witness having been interrogated whether or not Mr. Dunbar had prayed for the king in such terms as might be understood of the protestation; it was answered, that his ordinary form of prayer was “that God would keep and strengthen the king in the possession of Him;” but because he did not say “the king,” the clerk was ordered to write down, that he did not pray for king George. The witnesses were all sworn, upon oath, to declare which of the kings they meant Mr. Dunbar meant in his prayers; but the question on which his fate depended, was, “Did Mr. Dunbar use the

Thy sanctuary that is trodden down: so we, Thy people, and the sheep that are, will give Thee thanks for ever, and will shew forth Thy praise to all men. All these things, most gracious God, we beg of Thee, for the intercession of Jesus Christ, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.”—*possession of Capt. Sangster, R. N., Edinburgh, and first published in the Edinburgh Magazine, vol. v. p. 222. July, 1837.*

Wodrow’s Correspondence, ii. 166, 167.

² Ibid. ii. 141.

Liturgy of the Church of England?" All the witnesses answered to this in the affirmative. This was the only point that was fully proved; but it was enough, and from some unaccountable reason, although they condemned him, yet they referred the sentence to the synod, which was sitting at the same time, and in the same church. Mr. Dunbar was cited to appear at the bar of the synod on two hours' notice, instead of ten days' warning, according to the legal custom. Finding they were determined to make short work with him, Mr. Dunbar resolved not to appear; and in his absence the synod pronounced the sentence of deposition against him. Although they pretended that it was for sedition, yet the real crime for which he was deposed was *for using the English Liturgy*. "This was one of the boldest steps of their process, to suspend or depose such as were of a different communion from them, and who they knew would no more regard their sentences than if they had been pronounced by laymen [they were only laymen], though there had even been sufficient grounds for them; whereas indeed, generally, the probation was so very lame, as any other judicatory in Christendom would have been ashamed to have passed sentence upon it; yea, against some no probation at all was found, who yet, for all this, escaped not deposition¹."

WHEN THE Assembly met on the 3d of May, the earl of Rothes appeared as the commissioner, and William Hamilton was chosen moderator. The king in his letter, and the Assembly in their congratulatory address, speak of the late enterprise as an "unnatural rebellion." Now it so happened, that the parties engaged in it were convinced that it was the most natural course that they could pursue, and their bounden duty to God, and to him whom they considered their lawful sovereign. During the reign of queen Anne, neither the royal exile, nor his adherents, made any effort to recover the crown; they rested, upon apparently good grounds, on a legal restoration taking place, and without bloodshed, at her decease, and through her instrumentality; but as she died prematurely, and another family succeeded who were not the nearest in blood, her brother then endeavoured, by force of arms, to recover that crown to which he was born the undoubted heir. We who have lived a century after these events, can now see and admire the wonderful providence of God, in taking the sceptre for ever from the direct line of that family, and giving it to another branch of the same lineage. We also now see the crown that the

¹ Representation, 45, 46, 47.

lder James sacrificed for a mass, in the progress of passing from the Hanoverian to the Cobourg family, by our gracious queen's marriage with a prince of that ancient house. It becomes us short-sighted mortals, therefore, to contemplate these dispensations of Providence with emotions of gratitude to Him who "ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." In His great mercy He hath given the kingdom to our sovereign lady Queen Victoria—long and happily may she reign! eschewing the errors of her illustrious predecessors; and may it please God to set wise and heaven-aring councillors round her throne, and may her majesty, like the son of Rechab, *never "want a MAN to stand before GOD OR EVER."*

THE "venerable and good" Robert Douglass, lord bishop of Dunblane, died at Dundee on the 22d day of September, in the ninety-second year of his age, "full of piety as well as years." He was nearly related to the marquis of Douglass and the duke of Hamilton. On his deprivation he retired to Dundee, and it is probable he had officiated to a congregation in that town; but I have not been able to ascertain whether or not he did so, the present clergyman there, the Rev. H. Horsley, having declined to answer my inquiries.

BY A LETTER from bishop Nicolson, of Carlisle, to archbishop Wake, it appears that the Scottish prisoners were treated with great cruelty in Carlisle Castle. I cannot say much for the christian spirit evinced by the bishop: he regrets that "if justice be not executed upon them speedily, many of them will leave the world in a less exemplary way than they ought to do." The Castle was moist and unwholesome; several of them, he says, were "roaring in fits of the gout and fever," and they were all crowded into three small apartments, where they slept upon straw. He says, "I am hourly pestered with addresses and solicitations from the friends and advocates of these unhappy wretches, who will not believe when I tell them that I have neither power *nor inclination* to them any service. . . . Amongst the rest, the bishop of Edinburgh warmly recommends to my *counsel, direction, favour*¹, a son of his, who is one of our guests [a prisoner]. This youngster was taken in actual rebellion at the castle of Dunblane, and the father does not pretend to say that he repents of that sin; on the contrary, he gives broad scope of his being persuaded that his child now suffers for piety's sake. He will not so much as undertake to get the boy out of harm's way for the future, should he now

¹ The italics are the bishop's own.

be set at liberty; but rather intimates, that his present affliction renders him a proper object of all the good offices that I am capable of doing him. I have dealt very plainly with this mischievous prelate, who (by the way) bemoans the complete desolation of the Scottish church, and the insufferable hardships (*unde et a quo?*) of her poor clergy. I have let him know, that I will no more bestir myself for his son than I would for my own, in the like circumstances, but leave him entirely to God's mercy and the king's¹."

IN SUBSEQUENT letters the bishop says, the Scottish counsel, who came up to defend the prisoners, all demurred to the jurisdiction of the Court, as a breach of the articles of Union, in trying Scotchmen for crimes committed in their own country. This plea was overruled. But the bishop of Edinburgh had found means to interest others for his son; for bishop Nicolson says, that judge Tracey "had acquainted me with a like application in favour of the bishop of Edinburgh's son, made to himself by the earl of Caernarvon. Two such advocates were soon agreed to be worth a whole threave of them from the north; and thereupon I had leave to send for the young fellow to the bar, where he presently appeared, desired to be immediately arraigned, and (that being granted) pleaded guilty. This he did in so becoming a manner, and so good an appearance of a true penitent heart, that the judge promised to represent his case favourably to his majesty, whose mercy he confidently relies on. I had never seen the young man's face before, but was not a little pleased with his modest behaviour²." Bishop Douglass's son also appears to have been "out" at this time, and had nearly lost his life by "his unmannerly receipt of the transcript of his indictment at the bar, which was taken to be the effect of a peculiar stubbornness, and his being hardened in his iniquity." Archbishop Wake had sent a memorial to bishop Nicolson, to be presented to the judges, in favour of young Douglass. "I had formerly," says the bishop, "the very same from himself; and so had the judges, whom he had like to have provoked by his clownish behaviour at the bar. The man is a blunt well-meaning fellow of a traitor, and (were any to be executed) has a fair place for mercy. Both the judges and the king's counsel were directed particularly to be indulgent to sons that were led by their fathers, and servants that followed their masters into the rebellion. . . . Now this man and the bishop of Edinburgh's son were as duly trained up to a revolt against king George by their respective parents, as ever moss-trooper's children

¹ Ellis's Original Letters, iii. 367, 368.

² Ibid. 390, 391.

red to stealing; which I think brings them as fairly this rule as if the two prelates had galloped before into the battle¹."

CONSEQUENCE of being embarrassed by the presence of a commissioner, whose duty it was to preserve the rights of the crown from invasion, the Assembly was obliged to do this dirty work on the commission, which was now become *their right* also a part of their constitution. They then attempted to appoint a day for a national thanksgiving; but they were significantly informed that the crown had already made the appointment, although the proclamation had not yet come down. So, to save appearances, they determined to fix on the same day that the crown should appoint; and so no more was done, as the commissioners could accomplish that manœuvre when the proclamation should appear. But, says Wodrow, "we are like to be shut out of the exercise of *our power* as to fasts and thanksgivings by the Assembly; no assembly, that I mind of, having neglected any days of this nature these six or seven years²." The oath of abjuration was as obnoxious to the presbyterians as to the church, but upon different grounds. The former objected to it, because they thought the word AS bound them in limiting the succession, AS the same is limited or entailed by the crown of parliament. The nonjuring presbyterians considered themselves bound the successor to the crown to be in communion of the church of England, and consequently in their language, an homologation or acknowledgment of the lawfulness or divine right of episcopacy. According to their principles such a recognition was an act of sin; and therefore, on the 17th of November, the commission of the assembly met, and drew up an address to parliament—"That the oath of abjuration might be so qualified, that *tender consciences* take it." Many of the presbyterian ministers had taken the oath; the greater number had absolutely refused it, and the division betwixt the jurants and the nonjurants was so violent as nearly to have caused a schism in the kirk. It was now laid on the kirk, and an act passed to enforce it, wherein it was proposed to be enacted, "that all the ministers or legal ministers who have not taken the said oath, shall be obliged to take it before the ——— day of ——— next; and upon not obeying within that time, their churches shall become *ipso facto*, and they shall be prosecuted and turned

¹ Ellis's Original Letters, iii. 395, 396.

² Correspondence, ii. 202.

out of their parishes by the sheriff or his deputy, and all heritors and others are discharged to pay them any stipend; all presbyteries are obliged to declare their churches vacant, and all patrons are empowered and required to present another incumbent without delay." The commission petitioned the king to change the word AS into WHICH; and George has gained an immortal memory for having interposed "and got the parliament to turn the AS into WHICH" for the relief of those tender consciences that would not allow the church of England to enjoy her own principles. The oaths were now pressed on the episcopal clergy as a sort of test, and the aged bishop of Edinburgh was deprived of the pension which queen Anne had granted to him, on his refusing to take the oaths, on the 25th of November¹.

THE PRESBYTERIES deposed many episcopal clergy who were in possession of parish churches, without any proof whatever of the charges in their indictments. The Rev. Mr. Leith, of Lumfannan, in the diocese of Aberdeen, is an instance, among many. He received the following circular, dated December 7th:—"Notwithstanding of several addresses that the sheriff has made to you to forbear preaching, and the using of any ministerial function within your parish, after your being deprived by the presbytery; yet we understand, not only by your answers to the sheriff, but by the particular address from your presbytery to us, you are still preaching in church or house, and refusing access to the presbytery; upon which account application was made to general Carpenter, when at Aberdeen, to give orders to the commandant of his majesty's forces at this place, to afford parties, whenever desired by the deputy-lieutenants, justices, or sheriff deputed, for to apprehend your person, and to give access to the presbytery to your church. Yet we, being unwilling to use violent courses, if other can do, thought fit rather to give you this trouble, entreating you well not only to deliver the keys of your church to the presbytery, but to give them such satisfaction, that we shall not be farther troubled by them, otherwise you may be assured we will forthwith order a party for apprehending your person, and procuring access to your church. And that we may know what we may do, you will return an answer forthwith. (Signed) Arthur Forbes, of Echt, lieut. dep., Arch. Forbes, justice of the peace, Francis Forbes, sheriff-substitute²."

¹ Wodrow's Correspondence, ii. *passim*.—Salmon's Chronological History, ii. 68.—Letter to the Right Hon. the E — of —, concerning the Oath of Abjuration, as it relates to the Church of Scotland, in a bill now depending in parliament. 12mo. London, 1716.

² Representation, 47 and 92.

WHEN THE CLERGY demurred to the competency of the presbyteries to try them for any cause, but especially for alleged civil offences, they construed their declinatures into evidence of guilt. Because they denied a presbytery to be a competent judicary, therefore it was held that they confessed their offence before the presbytery! A monstrous inference, and worthy only a presbyterian court or a popish inquisition! Mr. Robertson, Longside, and Mr. Hepburn, of St. Fergus, were deposed on this plea. Mr. Gordon, of Rhynie, in the diocese of oray, was deposed on the evidence of one witness, and he is threatened with the highest censures of the church unless he submitted to his sentence. He naturally concluded they meant excommunication, about which he was very indifferent; but he found on the next Sunday that their highest censure was a military party inducting a presbyterian teacher into his church. Mr. Jeffery, at Alford, and Mr. Swan, at Pitsligo, were deposed, because, having preached on some week-days, it was concluded they had kept a fast for the exiled prince's success, and a thanksgiving for his arrival. Others were deposed because they had prayed as some of their own number did, ambiguously, for the *rightful king*, without adding the word *protestant*; which, by the way, is not one of the king of Great Britain's titles. The presbytery of Turriff met in a public-house at nine o'clock at night, and deposed Mr. Innes, of Currie, an aged man, in his sixty-eighth year, for being a zealous assertor of the liturgy, and for having brought it into his church. The sentence was solemnly proclaimed at the door of the public-house!¹

ALTHOUGH the two Maitlands had been deposed by the Assembly, and their churches had been declared vacant, yet, as they disowned its authority, they still retained their churches. The sheriff-substitute therefore wrote to Mr. John Maitland, saying, "I meet with several complaints against you as a disturber of the government and incendiary in the country you are in, which I am apt to believe, since your principles and proceedings in the time of the rebellion are very well known to me. I am very loath to meddle with any that *once* had your character, but your persisting in the ways of rebellion will oblige me to look after you. I therefore send you this intimation that you forthwith remove yourself and family from the manse of Currie, and give over your pretended ministerial function in that parish; or otherwise, depend upon it, I will take such methods to seize your person, and bring you to trial for

¹ Representation, 59, 60.

high treason, in order to which, upon your return to me (if not satisfactory), I will cause send a party of forces to lie at Turiff allennarly upon your account. (Signed) FRANCIS FORBES."

TO THIS LETTER, dated November 9, Mr. Maitland returned an answer on the 12th.—"Yours of date at Aberdeen the 9th current, came to my hands yesternight, and I give you thanks for the plainness and openness of it. I do not question you meet with many complaints and loud outcries against me; but I am not sensible that I have given just ground or occasion for them, and without prescribing to a person who acts in your capacity and station, it is very becoming and necessary not to listen too readily to those who are known to be very much prejudiced against me. I know that He whom (though most unfit and unworthy) I serve in the gospel, was traduced and represented as a mover of sedition and perverter of the nation, though His doctrine and example had no tendency that way, but the contrary; and the disciple is not above the Master.

"YOU ARE pleased to say that you are very loath to meddle with any that *once* had my character; and I beg leave to tell you that my character is altered much to advantage, having received ordination from the hands of an orthodox bishop, and therefore I am [now] a truly authorised minister of the gospel, with which my mind (agreeably to the sentiments of the catholic church in all ages, founded upon the clearest and most convincing reasons drawn from Scripture and apostolical tradition) is so fully satisfied, that I would not for any worldly consideration part with the latter and take up with the former. You desire me forthwith to remove myself and family from the manse of Forgue, and give over my pretended ministerial function within that parish. As to the former, I humbly conceive there is no law by which I can be obliged to quit that house till the term of next Whitsuntide; and though there were, yet, considering that it is the winter season, and that I am unprovided of any other place of residence, I am hopeful and confident that neither yourself, nor any other, exercising civil power, will contribute to put me to such a hardship. As to the latter, you will perceive, from what is said above, that I am in holy orders, so that my ministerial function is *not pretended*. Farther, you may be pleased to consider that I exercise my office on the Lord's-day *within my own house only*; and what less can be expected of any clergyman? And though several others come to be my hearers, yet I have no maintenance or encouragement from them; and I presume it will appear to yourself, as it does to me, that it would be extremely indecent and unbecoming on my part to shut the

against them. So that when all is duly pondered, I think this way of management, after this true account of fact, will give any offence. I hope this answer will give you satisfaction, and so prevent your being put to further trouble about me, and the using any methods to injure any person or distress my family. I entreat you will concur with your sentiments upon my case thus laid before
 (Signed) JOHN MAITLAND¹."

MESSENGERS that were sent by the different presbyteries were the churches vacant, used the most indecent and disorderly conduct. One entered in the time of divine service stood up with his hat on on the seat of a pew, and read the document declaring their pastor deposed, and the church vacant; another, finding the church door shut to prevent disturbance, kicked at it furiously with his feet, and not getting access, he opened a window, and, with his head covered, in the middle of the service, read the presbyteries' sentence: "The clergy, who never owned the jurisdiction of the presbyteries, were noways moved with the formality of declaring their churches vacant; they knew they had a just title to their offices and benefices, and were thence resolved to quit them till they were turned out by lawful authority by violent force. The latter expedient was more commendable and agreeable to the spirit of presbytery; they resolved, therefore, to lay hold on the opportunity of the forces that were garrisoned in Aberdeen and other adjacent places. But to engage them to the work was the difficulty: the army was presbyterian, but rather well affected to the liturgy, and paid some deference and respect to the clergy; they were therefore, being managed by another handle, to root out the army [the soldiers] really wished might flourish. They were therefore represented to them as disaffected to the government, and disturbers of the peace. If a people were to oppose a presbyterian teacher's coming in a violent and without form of law, to thrust out their lawful minister and take possession of his church, it was made to pass as a riotous and riotous mob against the civil magistrate²." James Strachan, of Glenkindy, and the sheriff-substitute, went through the county of Aberdeen with a military survey of the forfeited estates. This was an opportunity not neglected, seeing such another might not offer. A petitioning letter was procured by the importunity of the

¹ Representation, 84-87.

² Ibid. 66, 67.

several presbyteries, to be sent to the pastors of the churches through or near to which Glenkindy was to pass, desiring them to give full satisfaction to the presbytery, and thereby to prevent the military discipline that was to follow." These gentlemen sent military parties to Cruden, St. Fergus, Longside, and Pitsligo, on Saturday, the 29th of December, to take possession of the churches, induct presbyterian teachers and on Sunday to deliver the keys of the churches to them. If any resistance was made, the clergymen were threatened to be arrested and "brought to trial for *high treason*!" "The orders were most strictly observed on Saturday in the afternoon; they broke open the doors of the churches, turned them into guard-houses, set up fires, brought in beds, ate, drank, played at cards, &c. in them till Sunday morning; and as soon as the ordinary time of worship approached, they guarded all the avenues to the pulpit, to exclude the lawful pastor, who had now nothing left to do but to come with witnesses to the door, and require admission to his church, and when this was peremptorily refused, to return peaceably, and to leave them to guard the presbyterian teacher to his pulpit, which they did with all their military formalities¹. This open breaking in upon the *natural* fence of all religion, that is, the respect and reverence paid by all, who by debauchery have not quite extinguished all notions of religion to persons and places devoted to holy uses, mightily scandalized the people, and *heightened still their aversion to presbytery*. They looked upon it as Ahab's killing and then taking possession; but with this difference—there the natural life of one person only was taken away, whereas here the lives of *many thousand souls* was struck at, by exposing them to the poisonous doctrine of false teachers; the manner seemed to be an imitation of the French dragooning, and to savour more of the spirit of Mahomet than of Jesus Christ²."

THE SAME author continues—"the presbyteries, by their whole procedure from first to last, have thus given too much ground to believe that they have aimed more at the suppression of *episcopacy* and the *liturgy* than of sin and impiety, and at gaining churches than souls. The people also had in great abhorrence the profanation of churches; and they presaged from it that the doctrines that were to be taught by men who entered after this manner, would be little agreeable to the precepts and example of Jesus Christ. . . . All this procedure will look the more oddly, that *no law* was pretended to autho-

¹ Representation, 69.

² Ibid. 69.

ize the enforcing the censures of the church by armed troops and dragoons, *save the DESIRE of the PRESBYTERY*, who, by this military method of planting churches, made a plain discovery that their *fundamental charter, the INCLINATIONS of the people*, was no longer to be trusted to: since it so little appeared on this occasion that not one of a hundred of the parishioners was either tempted by curiosity or overawed by the armed party to have the presbyterian teacher in any of the four churches above named, and in some not even one of the whole parish came to hear him. Mr. Forbes at Slaines, the missionary for Cruden, was obliged to preach to his armed ward the same doctrine he designed for his new congregation, on Rom. i. 13, and his sermon was adapted to that occasion, though not one man or woman of the parish was his hearer¹."

1717.—IN A LETTER to Wodrow, dated Aberdeen, January 1st, it is said, "I wrote lately to you in a postscript to the copy of a letter that came from court, with respect to the episcopal clergy in Scotland, and I hear it is taking effect in these northern parts, for the sheriff-depute went last week in person, and laid five episcopal ministers aside. And the presbyteries of this synod, and in Mearns and Angus, are as ready upon the other hand; for when they cause any episcopal minister to be cited legally to compear before them, immediately upon his not coming they send a minister next sabbath and declare it [his church] vacant²." Mr. Salmon mentions, under date the 5th of January, that "the episcopal clergy of Scotland having been before fined for not praying for king George by name, were now *forced to fly their country* or to abscond³." And another author, before cited, says—"It is true the episcopal church was brought very low; yet the bishops and presbyters did what they could in a very private manner to preserve her a life; for a severe act of parliament passed discharging the episcopal clergy who had not taken the oaths required by the act of Toleration from officiating to any number of persons above eight, and the family in which they performed any part of their office. However, an act of indemnity passing in August, 1717, the episcopal clergy performed divine offices in as public a manner as they had done before the commotions of the year 1715. But their common enemies, the presbyterians, roaring out complaints, criminal letters were raised and executed against them, summoning them to appear before the

¹ Representation, 70, 71.

² Correspondence, ii. 220.

³ Chronological Historian, ii. 69.

therefore they do hereby prohibit and discharge all ministers and preachers who are discharged by the judicatories of the established church of Scotland to preach or to exercise any part of the ministerial function within the said churches, or in any part of the said parishes, *nor in their own houses*, except allendarly before those in their own family, and *none others*¹."

THIS ORDER had not the designed effect, for the people would not go near the presbyterian preachers, but came to the manse which the clergy still retained, and where they ministered to them. The presbyteries then took out decrees of ejection, which were illegally executed immediately, instead of giving forty days' warning, according to law. From the treatment of one of these worthy confessors, we may learn the fate of the whole of them. The magistrates of Aberdeen had some share in the patronage of the church of Nigg, which was then filled by Mr. James Maitland, the minister of Forgue's brother; and on the 9th of February they sent their recorder and factor to a corner of the parish, and convened some of the inhabitants. They required them to depone *super inquirendis* all they knew of their minister, particularly if he prayed for the pretender as king James, or observed a fast previous to his arrival in Scotland, or a thanksgiving after it. None of them could answer these questions in the affirmative, except one person. The magistrates ordered Mr. Maitland to deliver up the keys of his church, and to depart the parish immediately; and they conferred the church and parish on a Mr. Farquhar, who was a man of bad fame and immoral life, having begotten two children in fornication, and having changed from the church to popery, from which having been reclaimed by Dr. George Garden, he apostatised to quakerism, and then to presbytery; after that he became independent; and finally, seeing the scarcity of presbyterian teachers and the chance of a good living, he turned presbyterian again, and now he received the reward of his last change in the church and parish of Nigg. On the 4th of July, Farquhar ejected Mr. Maitland from his manse, and threw his furniture out of doors in a very rainy day, whereby it was entirely spoilt².

THE VIOLENT and barbarous manner in which the clergy were treated also extended to infants and sucklings; for the clergy being obliged to abscond, the people of their communion had great difficulty in accomplishing the baptism of their children, many of whom were kept for nearly two years with-

¹ Representation, 89, 90.

² Ibid. 93, 94.

tism rather than submit to its desecration by the pres-
 byterian teachers. Three substantial burgesses of Aberdeen
 were fined by the magistrates £20 Scots, for refusing to be-
 lieve the names of the clergymen who had baptised their children
 publicly. This not deterring others, they sent a procla-
 mation round by the drum, intimating to the inhabitants, that
 if they had their children baptized by any other than the
 ordained preachers, or did not register the name both of the
 child and the person who baptized him, they should be fined,
 a tradesman, being a freeman, in sixty pounds; a freeman,
 in thirty pounds; and every other inhabitant who were not free-
 men, in twenty pounds Scots; and this in the face of the Tolera-
 tion Act, which relieved the episcopal clergy of all pains
 and penalties¹. At a quarter sessions held in the city of
 Aberdeen, there was a larger attendance of justices than
 usual and among them men who understood the laws and had
 regard to justice. Many of the clergy were cited before
 them, but after two days' hearing the justices decided
 that their court was not one competent to try the clergy, as the
 were ecclesiastical. This was a disappointment that the
 presbyteries had not expected, and they "defamed the
 cause by most malicious and lying calumnies at home, and
 sent their hackney writer Ridpath [at London] to pub-
 lish to the world in his Flying Post." The ministers
 decided that their synod should meet at the same time with
 the justices, in the expectation that they would be able to di-
 rect how to act against the clergy; but their decision
 was a great disappointment in many respects. They resolved,
 first, to prosecute the clergy before the court of justiciary
 at Edinburgh, and the synod sent four of their number to
 the process. Ten of the clergy of the diocese of Aber-
 deen were cited to Edinburgh, and about seventy witnesses,
 on the 16th of December. The court sustained the sen-
 tence of deposition by the presbyteries, and sentenced the
 ministers to cede and restore their respective churches and glebes,
 to deliver the church utensils to the presbyterian intrants
 that and the 1st of February, 1718; and to remove
 their houses and manses betwixt that and the 8th of
 following; and to give bond and bail enacted in the
 acts of adjournal, of £10 sterling, as aforesaid. 2dly,
 to give bond and bail that they shall not disturb nor molest
 the intrants in the peaceable possession, as aforesaid, un-
 der penalty of 500 merks Scots. 3dly. They were fined

¹ Representation, 97.

in the sum of £25 sterling, to be paid to the pursuers [plaintiffs] in name of damages and expenses. 4thly. They were prohibited and discharged to preach or exercise any part of the ministerial function within their respective parishes, thereafter, under the penalty of 500 merks Scots. And lastly, they were ordained to be carried to prison, and there to remain, till the said fine was paid and bond and bail given¹." The foregoing is corroborated by one of Wodrow's correspondents, who says, "Saturday's post brought up the criminal letters against all the episcopal ministers in the bounds of the synod of Aberdeen; so that there will not be an episcopal minister in all their bounds that will either enjoy church or benefice, except those who kept very calm in time of rebellion, — Mr. Burnet, at Monymusk; Mr. Hay, at Udnie, and his brother at Monquhitter. The two Maitlands are to be cast out among the rest. But nothing could be done against the justices at the time," whom they petitioned the court of session to fine and punish².

MR. LUNAN, at Daviot, and Mr. White, at Mary-Coulter, being both about eighty, and unable to travel, were referred to the circuit court at Aberdeen in May next. Mr. Campbell of Alva, in Banffshire, was discharged from the bar in consequence of a material informality in his indictment; but Dundass, the solicitor, ordered him to be immediately arrested in the court till he should receive a new indictment, or subscribe an allegation unworthy of him. He was thrown into gaol, where he lay till the end of February. Mr. Lunan did not live long after this persecution, but he kept his church to the last, and was succeeded by his son, Patrick Lunan, who was placed in it by the favour of the patron and the affection of the parishioners³. He was, like his father, a man of singular integrity, simplicity of heart, and noble piety; and when, after several years' possession of the church, but not of the stipend, he was expelled, his parishioners all adhered to him, and formed the congregation whose descendants still meet at Mieklefolla; but they worshipped God in the open air, without any shelter. Bishop Petrie succeeded this good man, and erected a chapel, to which many of the congregation at present travel upwards of six miles every Sunday⁴.

IT MIGHT now be expected, says the author of the Representation of the State of the Church, "that, glutted with the spoils of the churches' revenues, and the exorbitant fines of

¹ Representation, 103.

² Representation, 104.

³ Wodrow's Correspondence, ii. 226, 227.

⁴ Episcopal Magazine, Feb. 1836, p. 52, 53.

se legal episcopal incumbents arbitrarily ejected, to make room for the sacrilegious intruders into the office, and usurpers of the spiritual authority of the sacred priesthood, they would be contented with the havock they had made. But it soon appeared their malice was not to be satisfied, and that the enjoyment of what they had thus injuriously wrested from their pious and peaceable neighbours could give no pleasure, whilst there were any of the orthodox and catholic clergy remaining to bear witness, by their patience and perseverance, to the suffering truth. Accordingly, they severely threatened all that were of the communion of the church, who were now deprived of the opportunity of the public worship, if they should assemble together in private with their persecuted pastors, that they would proceed against them according to the act of parliament for preventing and punishing riots, &c. The conscientious zeal of the good people for the regular worship, being nothing abated by these menaces, but choosing rather to suffer outward affliction than incur the guilt or spread the contagion of the deplorable schism, their next and most expedient (to root out episcopacy, and give a finishing stroke to what they had been so long, either by secret fraud or open violence, seeking to destroy) is by plundering and oppressing the few indigent clergy who read the liturgy in their own houses. Accordingly, their rage was with great violence discharged on the rev. Mr. Murray, in Aberdeen, who, on the 6th of this instant (May), was by the justices of peace fined in £20 sterling, and forbid to exercise any part of his ministerial function within the shire of Aberdeen. To add to the cruelty of this treatment, on the 12th he was summoned to make payment of the fine in fifteen days, or that they would seize and distrain his effects. The clerk of the said justices at the same time, instigated rather by their principles than by any necessity for such oppression, exacted a guinea of him for the extract of his sentence. It is the meanest instance of their malice in all their prosecutions, that the clerks of the several presbyteries have been so exorbitant in their fees for the extracts of the processes against the several episcopal ministers whom they have taken upon them to prosecute. The same spirit still works in them, and in the several paroxysms of the party's rage, it is to be feared the orthodox, religious, and pious remains of the episcopal communion in Scotland, will be left without a shepherd, exposed to the ravings of devouring wolves, pretended shepherds who entered not by the door, but climbed up another way of their own devising, and unheard of in the catholic

church for 1500 years ; and who seek rather themselves interest, power, and authority, than the establishment of peace, or brotherly love—the doctrines of the meek and lowly Jesus¹.”

IT IS REFRESHING in the midst of so many calamities to have to narrate one little episode in the history of our “ that trusted home might yet enkindle ” an union of churches. The Christians in Egypt were at this time undergoing persecution from their Turkish masters ; and Arsenius metropolitan of Thebais, had come to London, in order to solicit assistance from the church of England for their suffering brethren. Bishop Campbell became acquainted with Arsenius, and casually broached the proposition of a union of the churches ; and finding the Egyptian disposed to receive it favourably, he then made the proposal known to the king, the Gadderar and the non-juring bishops in London. . . . they were all favourable to the proposal, and some articles of agreement were drawn up and translated into Greek by Spincks, and presented to Arsenius, that he might communicate them to the eastern church. These proposals numbered twelve, to which was added a declaration, expressing wherein they agreed and wherein they disagreed with the Oriental church. There were five points, however, in which bishop Campbell and his coadjutors declared that they did not agree with the eastern church, viz.—“ 1st. They do not allow the same authority to the canons of general councils which is due to the Sacred Scripture. 2dly. They cannot receive any kind of worship to the blessed Virgin. 3dly. Nor to saints nor angels. 4thly. Nor give any religious veneration to images. 5thly. Nor worship the host in the Eucharistic sacrifice.” From England, Arsenius went to Constantinople and he mentioned the above proposal to the emperor Peter the Great, and also shewed him the proposition of the non-juring bishops. His majesty not only approved of the design, but directed one of his clergy, of the order of Archimandrites, a chief of monasteries, from amongst whom the bishops were always chosen, to assure bishop Campbell and his brethren of his readiness to promote so good a work by all the means in his power. Here this matter rested for the present, after thanks had been returned to the emperor².

THE ASSEMBLY met on the 2d of May, and the Count of Rothes was again sent down as commissioner. It appeared that “ the course of defection on which the church of Scotland

¹ Representation, 104—107.

² Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii.

had entered became more and more apparent every year, and the Assembly of 1717 was guilty of several acts more glaringly evil than those of its predecessors¹." Mr. Simson, professor of divinity in the university of Glasgow, had been covertly introducing Socinian doctrines; and having appealed from the presbytery to the Assembly, he was merely suspended from teaching, and from the exercise of any ecclesiastical function. While, says Dr. M'Crie, "the Assembly refused to condemn Arminian and Pelagian errors, they were forward to fix the stigma of Antinomianism on some articles of gospel truth. The presbytery of Auchterarder having, with the view of checking the progress of legal doctrine within their bounds, laid down the following proposition among others:—"That it is not sound and orthodox to teach that we must forsake sin, in order to our coming to Christ, and instating us in the covenant of grace; the General Assembly, on the same day on which they dismissed the first process against Mr. Simson, declared 'their abhorrence of the aforesaid proposition, as unsound and most detestable².'" "And the presbytery of Auchterarder was commanded to answer to the commission what they could design by such a proposition. Against this harsh sentence of the Assembly, several of the best ministers of the church remonstrated, but could not prevent its passing." Again, "The strong terms in which the Assembly condemned the proposition already quoted, will scarcely excite surprise, when the sentence is viewed as pronounced by polemical disputants. Yet the full amount of that polemical asperity which dictated a censure so severe against a proposition certainly true, though somewhat loosely expressed, could not be entirely accounted for without a closer view of the course adopted by the Neonomians³."

ANOTHER attempt was to have been made for the restoration of the representative of the elder branch of the house of Stuart. Charles XII., the brave king of Sweden, resented king George as elector of Hanover, having entered into a confederacy with the enemies of his kingdom during his seclusion in Turkey; and in consequence, he determined to invade Scotland with 12,000 veteran Swedes, with arms and ammunition for 15,000 men whom he had reason to expect would join his standard. This project was much better concerted than the earl of Marr's enterprise; a few days would have been sufficient to have transported the Swedes to the eastern coast

¹ Hetherington, 203.

² Testimony Ass. Synod of Orig. Seceders, 43.

³ Hetherington, 204, 205.

of Scotland; the highlanders would have been in arms, and the adherents of the exiled prince would all have joined the invader, and a battle might perhaps have decided the controversy betwixt the rival princes. But a discovery of the design put an end to the project, and Charles having been killed the following year, James had no farther hope from that quarter¹.

1718.—AN ACT OF INDEMNITY having been passed last year, gave the church a short respite from her afflictions, and the episcopal clergy were again permitted to perform divine service in a public manner, without let or molestation. In the early part of this year, bishop Christie, the friend of bishop Sage, died, of whom nothing more is known than that he retained the affection and esteem of his brethren. Bishop Rose, acting as metropolitan, considered it necessary to make some additions to the episcopate; so that in the event of a restoration of the exiled family to the throne, which they all seemed to contemplate, there might not be again any necessity to apply to England for a new consecration. He selected Mr. Arthur Millar, who had been ejected from the church and parish of Inveresk, in the diocese of Edinburgh, at the revolution, and Mr. William Irvine, who had been barbarously rabbled out of his parish of Kirkmichael, in the diocese of Glasgow. Mr. Millar was particularly active in promoting the fund and subscriptions formerly mentioned, for the subsistence of the rabbled and deprived clergy that were reduced to a state of starvation. He made several journeys to Ireland, where he was most kindly received by the bishops of that church, and from whom he received liberal subscriptions. The duke of Ormond, the lord lieutenant, also granted him a brief, by whose authority collections were made in all the churches. Mr. Millar and Mr. Irvine were therefore consecrated by bishop Rose, assisted by bishop Fullarton and bishop Falconar, on the 22d of October, in bishop Rose's chapel in Edinburgh; but they had no dioceses assigned to them².

THE OATH of abjuration was very objectionable to the clergy, and also to the greater part of the presbyterian ministers. Wodrow says, he knew many in all parts of the country who had objections, and felt "difficulties from the oath not answering the ends of its imposition, and its being really no test of loyalty, and consequently an *useless* imposition; and least of all a proper test for ministers, who pray every day oftener

¹ Tindal's Continuation, ii. 75.

² MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.—List of Consecrations, p. 38.—Primitive Truth and Order, Appendix, 520.—Keith's Catalogue, Appendix, 526.—Skinner's Ecclesiastical Hist. ii. 621.—Perceval's Apology, 254.

than once for king George, and have and will appear to their utmost for him in every case. And the praying for him being a plain Scripture command, and nowise a homologation of sinful laws, it is a sufficient test, and more, at least as much, trying to the episcopal clergy, because done before their hearers, than swearing; and I dare assert it, there is not an episcopalian minister in Scotland who prays for king George, but will swear allegiance to him, and take this oath; or if they have any difficulty, it is only from the abjuration of the Pretender, which no presbyterian minister I know of has any strait about. Others have difficulties from their people, and giving offence to them, who are not capable of being persuaded but that the oath involves a homologation of the Union, at least of patronages, or the English ceremonies¹."

ON THE 21st of August the exiled prince married the princess Clementina, third daughter of prince James Sobieski, the eldest son of John Sobieski, the king of Poland, who gained that memorable victory over the Turks when they were besieging Vienna. Her mother was the daughter of the duke of Newburgh, the eldest branch of the Palatine family. The princess Sobieski was seized at Inspruck, on her journey to Italy, by the emperor's orders, and kept prisoner there a considerable time; but she found means to escape, and joined her husband, to whom she bore two sons².

1719.—"ABOUT THE YEAR 1719, the heat of persecution abating, the episcopal clergy began their public offices of reading prayers, administering the holy sacrament, and preaching the doctrines of christianity. They have it for a principle not to disturb the peace of the kingdom they belong to, but rather to suffer the greatest hardships, and in patience to possess their souls³." There was a bill introduced into parliament on the 20th of February, entituled "An Act for strengthening the Protestant Interest in these Kingdoms," which was intended to repeal the Act to prevent Occasional Conformity, and the Act to prevent the Growth of Schism. It was proposed that persons who came to qualify themselves for any office should acknowledge the Holy Scriptures to be of divine inspiration, and to declare their faith in the Holy Trinity. But the spirit of infidelity had fallen so heavily upon all the upper classes of society—the age of Laodicean lukewarmness had so deadened their perceptions of sacred things, that this simple proposal was rejected, as being too great a restraint on free-born Englishmen!⁴

Correspondence, ii. 409.
MS. Memoirs, 9.

² Salmon, ii. 85.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 88—Skinner, ii. 620.

ON THE 6th of March an express arrived from France, bringing intelligence that the Spaniards were making great preparations at Cadiz for an invasion of the realm of England, and that their fleet would put to sea about the middle of March. The king communicated this intelligence to both houses of parliament, and demanded farther supplies to maintain his crown against his rival. That prince arrived at Madrid on the 26th, in one of the king of Spain's carriages, and attended by his life-guards, and he was received with all the honours usually shewn to a crowned head. Government immediately issued a proclamation, offering a reward of £5,000 for the arrest of the duke of Ormond, £1,000 for every attainted peer, and £500 for every gentleman under the degree of a peer. A reward of £1000 was offered for the apprehension of the earl of Lucan, who, with several officers, had landed in Ireland, to raise men to co-operate with the Spaniards and highlanders in Scotland. On the 4th April, the earls Marischal and Seaforth, and the marquis of Tullibardine, with about 400 Spaniards, landed in Kintail in Rosshire, and brought arms for two thousand men. General Wightman, with the troops under his command, advanced to meet the Spaniards, who had been joined by about sixteen hundred highlanders, and totally routed them at the pass of Genshields. The highlanders dispersed, but the Spaniards surrendered themselves as prisoners of war. The earl of Seaforth, the commander of the invading forces, was wounded in the shoulder; but who, with the other two noblemen, made his escape to the Orkneys¹. A reward of £2000 each was offered for the apprehension of any of them. In Scotland, says Tindal, "there appeared no remains of rebellion. The chiefs being retired, the highlanders surrendered their arms, and the regency seemed to fear no disturbance from that quarter, nor had they any orders to give. However, the evil was not quite cured, of which were seen now and then some strange proofs. At Edinburgh alone, five ministers cited before the magistrates, refused to acknowledge king George, and their churches were forced to be shut up²."

WHEN THE established episcopacy of England was treated with so much disrespect as it had been, the persecuted prelacy of Scotland could not expect much tender regard. An act was passed in April "for making more effectual the laws appointing the oaths for the security of the government to be taken by ministers of churches and meeting-houses in Scot-

¹ Salmon, ii. 92, 93—Culloden Papers, 73.

² Tindal, ii. 121-136.

land¹." By this act every episcopal clergyman that performed divine service in any meeting-house or chapel within Scotland without having taken the oaths in terms of queen Anne's Toleration, and praying for king George by name, and the royal family, was to suffer six months' imprisonment, and to have his meeting-house shut up for six months. Every dwelling-house where nine or more persons, besides the family, were present during divine service, was declared to be a meeting-house within the meaning of this act. Tindal informs us, that five of the clergy suffered imprisonment under this severe act, but Mr. Skinner says,—“The description of what was to be deemed a meeting-house liable to the penalty, allowed them a certain degree of legal freedom, and even encouraged them to depend upon further connivance from those to whom the execution of the law was committed.”

THE SEEDS of a schism, that afterwards took deep root, were sown at this time, in consequence of the persecution that the church endured at the hands of the presbyterians. And the people being determined to worship God by the English liturgy, they resolved to have qualified clergymen to officiate, as most of the Scottish clergy (from principle) still declined to take the oaths. The following letter will shew the distress into which the clergy were thrown, betwixt what they considered their duty and the impatience of their flocks. It was from the ejected incumbent of the town and parish of Forfar, to bishop Rose, and is dated Forfar, August 4, 1719:—

“MAY IT please your lordship:—The people of our town, and country about, being generally averse from joining the presbyterian worship; and having been so long deprived of the benefit of public worship performed by an episcopal minister, that they begin to find the dismal effects of it, both among their children and those of greater age; and seeing that the government hath shut us up, who are their own ministers, under such circumstances (which grow still worse and worse), that they can have no reasonable expectation of being relieved by us in that particular; our magistrates, together with some gentlemen in the neighbourhood (though very well affected yet), have resolved to call a man who is qualified according to law, and set up a meeting-house in this town, only they want your lordship's permission, without which I cannot give my countenance unto it, and which, if they had, I doubt

¹ Salmon, ii. 90.

not but they would oblige the gentleman whom they call, both to undertake and to act in subordination to my ministry in this congregation; whereas, on the other hand, if I shall go about to oppose them (they are so bent and firmly resolved upon the thing), it will raise a woful schism among us. Wherefore I have despatched an express with this line unto your lordship, not only informing you (according to my duty), but also humbly entreating you may be pleased to consider it as a matter of the greatest importance with respect to this place, and accordingly to grant us your favourable answer. For though I cannot partake of their worship, but must still continue to worship God in my own house as before, yet, if your lordship will permit me to give countenance to their meeting-house, the schism may be prevented; all things may be done in subordination to my ministry, and we may be kept in unity among ourselves. I have presumed to write the foregoing lines unto your lordship; and if you shall think fit that I come and speak with you farther upon that affair, you shall be, God willing, very readily attended by, my lord, your lordship's most obedient son, and most humble servant,

AL. SMALL¹."

IT DOES not appear what answer bishop Rose had returned to the above letter, nor how this affair had been adjusted; but it is very likely that wilful men would have their own way.

1720.—IN THE BEGINNING of the month of March, bishop Rose had a fainting fit, but from which he recovered; but on the 20th of the same month he went to his sister's house in the Canongate, to visit his brother, who was then in bad health, and died there of another fainting fit, in the 74th year of his age. He governed the church as a metropolitan, from the death of archbishop Ross in 1704, and, "during all that long period [from the Revolution, 1688] the episcopal church of Scotland had profound peace *within herself*, whatever heavy afflictions she groaned under from the state and presbyterian kirk; yet all the clergy, generally speaking, were of *one mind*; no factions nor divisions among them; whatever sparks of these did begin to appear were wisely extinguished by the vigilance of the pious Dr. Rose, the bishop of Edinburgh, the longest-lived of any of the ante-revolution bishops [in either kingdom], and on whom alone all the government of the epis-

¹ Original Letter in the possession of the Rev. John Marshall, first published in the Episcopal Magazine for January, 1837, p. 15.

copal church in Scotland devolved for many years before his death¹." He commendably supported the dignity of an office more weighty than lucrative through a calamitous course of thirty-three years, and for a long time struggled with a grievous indisposition of body, and was at last, in great mercy to himself, relieved from all his labours in the 74th year of his age, but to the heavy grief of his friends and the church. He was a man whom it was acknowledged by all that knew him, that "for all the virtues which adorn the gentleman or the scholar, the christian or the bishop, he was scarcely equalled, and could not be excelled. What a valuable pilot he was while he steered the helm of our tossed vessel, was but too sensibly known by some unhappy divisions which followed soon after his death²." He was buried in the cemetery which surrounds the ruined church of Restalrig, on the Wednesday after his decease. Bishop Keith says that he was one of his presbyters in the city of Edinburgh, from Pentecost, anno 1713, to the time of his death, and describes him as "as a sweet-natured man, and of a venerable aspect." The anonymous author of the *Memoirs* terms him "the incomparable Dr. Rose." "He lived still in the city of Edinburgh, and had the chance to outlive all the brethren of his order, and all the bishops likewise in England, who had been possessed of sees before the Revolution; so that he had much respect paid him, not only by the clergy of his own communion, but all the laity also of both nations³."

IT MUST NOW BE EVIDENT, almost to demonstration, that the riotous conduct of a few malcontents in Edinburgh in the year 1637, was not the effect of public opinion against the liturgy, but wholly the work of a faction. From what we have seen since the Revolution, neither the people nor the clergy were averse to liturgical worship; but, on the contrary, when left to themselves, they desired it, and resorted to it. Indeed, a great deal of the persecution that befel the church at this time was directed against the liturgy, from a sort of instinctive and well-grounded apprehension that the sober decency of the manner, and the catholic truth of the matter, would gain upon the hearts and affections of the people whom they had corrupted from the gospel of Christ to another gospel⁴.

THE TWO GRAND grievances of which the presbyterians complained at this time, were, Patronages and Toleration. The former has been to their body a fruitful source of division,

¹ MS. *Memoirs*, 10.

² Keith's *Catalogue*, 64.

³ Skinner, ii. 621, 622.

⁴ Gal. i. 8, 9.

and has produced a considerable number of denominations, who all claim to be the most sound and orthodox presbyterians; yet, strange to say, they will neither hold fellowship with the mother from whom they have separated, nor yet with each other! The only point on which they are all unanimous is in the repudiation of patronage, which they consider deprives the people of their *divine right* to elect their own teachers, and dries up the “marrow of modern divinity.” Wodrow calls it “a church-ruining burthen”—“the re-imposition of that burthen hath been the *greatest crush* that could have been given to the ministry of this church.”

THE PATIENT man says, that “Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards.” Churches have also their periods of affliction, as well as individuals; and as it pleased God to deliver over the church of Scotland to the wrath of man, there can be no doubt of its having been for some good purpose. Affliction is the instrument by which He fans and winnows the chaff from the wheat, as He made the people of God suffer adversity and oppression in Egypt and the wilderness, before He brought them to the land that flowed with milk and honey. Indeed, Christ himself, the head of the church, was exercised by affliction and suffering, for the great work of her redemption:—“For it became Him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.” It becometh not the disciple to be above his master, nor the body to fare better than its Head. He afflicted the Scottish branch of the vine, and purged it, that it might bring forth good fruit. He laid His chastening hand upon that portion of his church that He might teach her wisdom, for outward prosperity frequently hardens the heart:—“I spake unto thee when thou wast in prosperity, but thou saidst I will not hear.” But the church can now say, with holy David,—“It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes.” This severe chastisement which she underwent made her cast aside the presumptuous system of extemporary worship, that dared to address God with less circumspection than they would have spoken to fellow-sinners, and to adopt grave and orthodox prayers and services, by which both priest and people humbly address God with one heart and one mouth. That was one blessed consummation which persecution realized; but one still remained to be expelled, the extirpation of which some internal afflictions afterwards accomplished,—I mean a secular spirit.

ALL THE ATTEMPTS that were made by the exiled princes

and their friends were called "wicked and unnatural rebellions," and, without doubt, rebellion is wicked and unnatural; but the actors did not think that they were rebelling against their lawful sovereign. James had been driven from the throne by the treachery of his own army and the military force of his son-in-law; and although for his own personal safety he withdrew with his son from the kingdom, yet he never ceased to claim the crown, nor his adherents to acknowledge his title. It is not to be supposed that merely a few individuals in Scotland adhered to him; it is unquestionable that throughout the three kingdoms a very great proportion of the people recognized his rights, and heartily wished him in possession of them. When he and his son attempted to invade the kingdom, it was for the purpose of recovering that of which he had by rebellion and force been deprived. His adherents considered James's authority as lawful and as binding on them; and they rose in arms, not under the detestable character of rebels, but as obedient subjects to the command of their lawful prince, against an usurper. The achievement of the prince of Orange can only be viewed either as rebellion or as conquest; but a new name was given to it of *deliverance*. As an armed mediator, the prince of Orange might have accomplished our deliverance from popery and arbitrary power without dethroning his father-in-law, and taking possession of his crown. He himself seems to have had some misgivings on this subject; for he offered to secure the succession to his brother-in-law. Although the sceptre had for ever departed from that renowned house, and we can now perceive it, yet our ancestors could not look into the womb of futurity, and foresee or prognosticate that which we now know. They could not call it rebellion in James VII. and his son to attempt the recovery of the crown of which they had been forcibly and unjustly deprived, any more than it was in Charles II. to make a similar attempt, or for James himself to succeed to his brother against the efforts of the Whigs. David and Joab might as well be called rebels because they fought against Absalom, who had usurped his father's throne, and recovered it. The gallant troops that conquered at Waterloo might, upon the same principle, be called rebels, because they opposed the prince in possession, and recovered the throne of France for the dethroned monarch. So that whatever has been said on the sin of rebellion in this work does not apply to this particular case, inasmuch as the exiled prince sought only to recover possession of that crown to which he was born the heir, and to which he would have

succeeded, but for the seizure of the throne by his brother-in-law, the prince of Orange.

AT ALL EVENTS the episcopalians were not more concerned in these enterprises than the presbyterians were, for both parties stood shoulder to shoulder together, but the whole vengeance of the government fell upon the former. The presbyterian martyrology is entirely composed of men who suffered for rebellions against sovereigns in possession by unquestionable and undoubted right, and for whose throne there were no competitors. In this case there was a competitor, whom his friends thought had a preferable right, and that the longer sword alone could settle the dispute between the rival claimants. The prince in possession held the longest and the sharpest sword; and he exercised it with excessive rigour on the noblemen and gentlemen who were so unfortunate as to fall into his hands. The exiled prince promised a full indemnity to all that had been opposed to him, had he succeeded in his enterprise, and whom the law would then have called both rebels and traitors. The church has ever held rebellion to be a great sin; but so many good men and fathers of the church having refused the oaths to the revolution government, shewed that they did not account their adherence to their oaths to the prince and his heirs to whom they had taken them, to be a rebellion. The refusal of the oaths rested on a different principle from the rising in arms. To swear to the revolution government involved them in *perjury* as well as in a direct falsehood in a matter of fact; for the prince of Orange was not James's heir, and therefore not the lawful hereditary sovereign. But the Hanoverian line of princes obtained possession; and the powers that be are ordained of God. We have our Lord's own example, teaching us to submit to an usurper's government, and of recognizing its divine title—both in the case of the tribute-money, and in his own recognition of Pilate's power, which He said was given him from above. The Roman power in Judea was by the usurpation of conquest and therefore it had, perhaps, been better for our ancestors to have eschewed privy conspiracy and rising in arms. Had He not given the kingdom to another, He would have raised up some man fitted by prudence and courage to have recovered his master's throne, and would not have suffered incapable adventurers, destitute of military capacity or resources, to sacrifice their own and their followers' lives and properties, without being of the slightest benefit to the cause they wished to serve but only to entail calamity and persecution on the church.

CHAPTER LXIII.

ELECTION OF THE RIGHT REV. JOHN FULLARTON, LORD
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH.

ing of the clergy of Edinburgh—position of the clergy.—Another bishop Fullarton elected to the see of Edinburgh.—Falconar elected bishop of Aberdeen—and of Fife.—Bishop Fullarton's letter.—James's letter.—The bishop's address.—1721.—Clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen.—Bishop Campbell.—The Usages.—Bishop Hickey—bishop Collier—bishop Spincks—Bishop Rose's letter and proceedings.—The clergy led in opinion on the usages.—Bishop Falconar's letter—the principles.—The liturgy and communion service.—Assembly.—Popery.—Episcopal supremacy.—Lockhart's letter.—Reflections.—Answer to Lockhart.—Dr. Leslie—his death.—Proclamations.—Jesuits.—China.—The election of bishops Cant and Freebairn.—Lockhart's letter respecting the election.—Bishop Gadderar.—Meeting of the College of Bishops—bullied by the king.—Diocese of Aberdeen.—Usages.—Formula.—General Assembly of 1723.—“Marrow of modern divinity.”—1723.—The English clergy.—Meeting of the college—their address.—Note, prayers for the king.—Formula.—Bishop Falconar—his letter.—A letter from the royal physician Gadderar.—Communion office.—Mr. Cheyne's vindication—his opinion in signing the formula.—Bishop's second letter.—Lockhart in opposition to Bishop Gadderar.—The cry of Popery.—Lockhart's character of the king.—Death of bishop Falconar.—Increase of episcopal character from Lockhart.—A letter from the bishops to the prince.—Bishop Gadderar.—The connection of church and state.—The royal superstitions.

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs already named, says, after the death of “that valuable and worthy prelate Bishop Rose, the clergy of Edinburgh, and the immediate neighbourhood, to the number of forty-eight, had a meeting for the purpose of electing a bishop to succeed him, and, as Mr. Skinner says, to “advise among themselves whether it was proper now to make any advance towards the choice of a successor, which having been the privilege, they concluded was their privilege, now that the connection of the church with the state, which had brought in

another method, was dissolved." This meeting was attended by bishops Falconar, Millar, and Irvine, "who had concealed their characters, but now openly owned them¹." That is, bishop Rose had consecrated them solely for the purpose of maintaining the succession, and preventing the necessity of having a third time to apply to England for new consecrations. They had not received any diocese, or the superintendence of any portion of the flock of Christ, because during the lives of any of the anti-revolution bishops it was determined that they should not take a part in the general government of the church, but merely to assist their seniors in keeping up the episcopal order, till, they delusively hoped, a second restoration of the exiled family should take place.

SUCH, SAYS ONE of the most eminent of their successors, "was the plan of procedure, suggested by the necessity, and recommended no doubt by various circumstances, as most likely to answer the purpose for which it was adopted. And however unsuitable and improper it may now appear to us, before we can form any just or candid judgment of the notions that gave rise to it, we shall find it necessary to look back a little to the state of things at that period, and consider what might be the sentiments and feelings of the bishops and clergy of the lately established church, whom the Revolution had deprived of their livings and many valuable privileges, had reduced to the most abject poverty and pitiable distress, and thereby thrown into a state of dependence on the hopes of that family for the support of whose interest they had suffered this deprivation, and all these accumulated hardships. It is painful, even at this distance of time, to reflect on the violent and barbarous manner in which these unhappy sufferers were driven from their former possessions. The remembrance of such strange and unexpected severity was not likely to be soon effaced; and some of the political measures of those times were but ill adapted to conciliate the minds of persons who had so much cause, as they thought, for being disaffected to the established government. Hence it was that the shattered remains of the old *national* church came to be considered as a society kept together for no other purpose than to serve the interests, and support the pretensions, of the exiled family. On some of the principal friends of that family many of the persecuted clergy had been obliged to depend for protection and support, and, in consequence of that dependence, had been much influenced by the wishes and opinions of their

¹ MS. Memoirs, 11—Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 628.

patrons. It may also be supposed, that some of them would retain as much of the prevailing opinion, respecting the necessary connection between the mitre and the crown, as might lead them to suppose that the church could not possibly subsist without admitting the same interposition of regal authority in the nomination of its bishops to which they had been accustomed in the times of constitutional and legal episcopacy.

“VIEWING THINGS in this light, and encouraged, perhaps obliged, to take such measures as were most agreeable to those persons of rank and influence on whom they depended, a part, though but an inconsiderable part, of the Scottish episcopal clergy, contrived a new scheme for managing the government of their church, till it should be seen whether there was any probability, as they perhaps might be led to hope, from their remembrance of what had formerly happened, of recovering her ancient privileges. The plan proposed was shortly this—that after the death of the bishop of Edinburgh (. . .) all the bishops who had been consecrated since the Revolution, and were then alive, should be formed into an episcopal college for the general purpose of preserving a succession of bishops and ordaining inferior clergy, but without pretending to local jurisdiction, or the charge of any particular district, which, as they could not obtain without the formal sanction of government, they thought it better to decline, out of respect to the suffering situation of the person whom they acknowledged as their king. The scheme, accordingly, was no sooner proposed, than it received his approbation, and on this plan a few promotions soon after took place, in consequence of recommendations from the exiled prince. But notwithstanding of this shadow of support to the collegiate scheme of church government, and however proper and respectful to the unfortunate house of Stuart it might have appeared in the eyes of a few individuals, it was far from being acceptable to the clergy in general, or giving any satisfaction to the great body of the laity, who adhered to the communion of the Scottish episcopal church. They longed for the revival of diocesan episcopacy, as that form of church government to which they had always been accustomed, and which they knew to be most conformable to the primitive model. They saw no necessity for confounding the things of God with the things of Cæsar; and since it was an undoubted fact, that the adventitious privileges granted by the state had laid the foundation of the grateful concessions made by the christian church, they considered that part of it to which they belonged,

being now destitute of all secular support or encouragement from the state, as at full liberty to betake itself to its own intrinsic powers, and make what provision was necessary for the succession and continuance of its sacred orders. There could be no occasion for asking a license from the crown for the election of bishops, who were not to be distinguished by any mark of the royal favour, nor to enjoy any peculiar benefit for the support of their profession. They might surely be promoted now, as they had been of old, before christianity became a religion established by law. And when no interposition of royal authority, no interference of the state, was to be expected, as the church was left at liberty to exercise those powers communicated by her divine founder for preserving her in existence, so, whilst this was done in a quiet and becoming manner, there was no reason to fear that government would be offended¹."

THE THREE BISHOPS who attended this meeting "regretted that they had not their diplomata to satisfy the presbyters; but that they had a senior bishop, John Fullarton, who lived at a distance, and whom they soon expected in Edinburgh, having acquainted him of the death of the good bishop of Edinburgh, and then all of them should produce their diplomata²." This meeting only agreed to the necessity of electing a successor in the see of Edinburgh; but with a strange secular feeling of jealousy, the old priests, that had been ejected at and after the Revolution, yielded with reluctance the privilege of having a share in the election to those of their brethren that had been ordained subsequent to that event. The next meeting, on the 28th of April, was very fully attended, and bishop Fullarton having arrived from Paisley, near which place he had some property, he and the other three bishops fully satisfied the clergy present of their consecrations. They "owned that they were bishops of the church of Scotland, for preserving the episcopal succession; yet they did not pretend to have any jurisdiction over any place or district, and desired the presbyters to elect a bishop for themselves³." This appears to have been all the business transacted on the first day of the meeting. They met again the following day, and with due formality elected the right reverend father-in-God, John Fullarton, to be the bishop of Edinburgh; who immediately accepted the office, and the election was ratified and confirmed by his three brethren, who were present, bishops Fat-

¹ Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated, 390-394.

² MS. Memoirs, 1 .

³ Ibid.

conar, Millar, and Irvine. It was decided, however, at this meeting, that the new bishop of Edinburgh should not succeed to, nor exercise, the metropolitical jurisdiction which had been conceded to bishop Rose as vicar-general of the province of St. Andrews; but that bishop Fullarton should only have the privilege of convocating his brethren when the affairs of the church required their consultation, and to preside *ex officio* at all such meetings¹.

ON THE 3d of May, bishop Falconar officially communicated the result of this meeting to the bishops Campbell and Gadderar, then resident in London. Bishop Falconar resided in St. Andrews, and soon after the late meeting, the clergy in the counties of Forfar and Kincardine united in inviting him by letter to become their diocesan, and to take upon him the spiritual government and superintendence of the church in that district, and of the people committed to their care, "promising in their letter to acknowledge him as their proper bishop, and to pay all due and canonical obedience to him as such." He had been often sent into the district, which he was now to consider as his diocese, by the late bishop Rose, to perform episcopal duties, and consequently was familiar with all the clergy, and much respected by them. He accepted their "affectionate call;" and, at the same time, he was also elected by the clergy of the county of Fife, or part of the archbishoprick of St. Andrews, to be their diocesan. He presided over both these districts till his death. This matter of resuming the ancient mode of government by assigning particular dioceses to the bishops, seems to have been the subject of correspondence betwixt the primate and the two bishops residing in London, from the following extract of one of his letters, cited by Mr. Skinner, dated September 15th, 1720. He says, "I freely own that the project of dividing the kingdom into districts, and having a bishop to superintend in every district, is a most desirable thing, if the practice were as easy as the theory. But, alas! there is none of us able to maintain ourselves in these districts, and the people will give little or nothing to subsist them; nay, the very presbyters that officiate among them are *in great straits*. Dr. Falconar will be very acceptable to the most part of our clergy, and laity, too, of our communion on the north side of Forth; and perhaps there may be a way fallen on to settle him in some part of that country. But we have no view of getting any to

¹ Skinner, ii. 629.

settle elsewhere, unless you two would come down and to districts. “(Signed) JOHN, BISHOP OF EDINBURGH¹.”

MR. LOCKHART, of Carnwath, who acted as a political agent or minister for the home department for the exiled prince says there was an appearance of factions and divisions among the clergy of Edinburgh respecting the government of the church. He pretends that he exerted that influence which his position gave him to heal these divisions, and to persuade them to elect bishop Fullarton, and even promised to procure the settlement on the bishop of £100 sterling per annum, to enable him to bear the charge of living at Edinburgh. He communicated the state of ecclesiastical matters to James, and recommended him to concur in the election of bishop Fullarton; and he expresses his disapprobation of their proceeding to an election without first having obtained James’s permission and sanction. The exiled prince wrote to the bishop of Edinburgh, as he had been requested by Lockhart, dated Albano, June 12 . . . “You will sufficiently find by this confidence and esteem I have for you. I do not fear being disappointed, and all I have in particular to recommend you is, the preaching of union and charity both to the clergy and laity, since it is that alone which can, with God’s blessing, make us see an end of our misfortunes; both while these last and after it may please God to put a period to them, the welfare of the Scots clergy I shall ever have at heart, and shall at all times be desirous of shewing you the deep sense I have of your personal merit, and attachment to me and just cause².”

THE PRIMATE and other bishops transmitted an address to the exiled prince, who was then at Rome; but Mr. Lockhart has not preserved any copy of it. To this address he returned the following answer, dated Rome, July 2d, 1720:—

“WE RECEIVED with particular pleasure the first assurance you gave us of your loyalty, and of your affection to our person and family, by your address of the 5th of May. We have the deepest sense of the sufferings that the bishops and clergy of the church of Scotland have undergone at all times for their firm adherence to our family, and will not fail to give them the strongest marks of our protection, gratitude, and

¹ Skinner’s Ecclesiastical History, ii. 629, 630.

² Lockhart Papers, ii. 35-39.

esteem, when it shall please God to put us in possession of our kingdoms. It is a satisfaction to us to know that the bishops, who survived the unhappy Revolution in our kingdoms, have promoted persons of your character to their order; and since the circumstances of past times have not permitted certain forms to be observed, we think it proper hereby to approve of your promotion in so far as our authority is necessary to it by the laws and constitution of that our ancient kingdom; but as to such future promotions as may be thought necessary for the preservation of your order, we think it equally for our service and that of our church that, notwithstanding our present distance from you, you should propose to us such persons as you may think most worthy to be raised to that dignity. We shall, you may be assured, have all possible regard for your opinion in such cases, and ever be willing to give you marks of our favour and protection, and of our particular esteem for your persons¹."

1721.—THE SUCCESS of the clergy in the districts over which bishop Falconar presided, in obtaining a regular diocesan, induced those of Aberdeenshire to exert their undoubted privilege of enjoying the benefit of a resident bishop. Mr. Skinner says, the clergy of Aberdeen made application to the bishops for their license to proceed to an election, and obtained it; but the author of the *Memoirs* alleges, "the presbyters of the diocese of Aberdeen being convoked by their dean, resolved to elect a bishop for themselves²." At all events, they did elect bishop Archibald Campbell, then residing in London, to be their bishop, on the 10th of May; and after the long interval of three months, they notified his election, on the 2d of August, to the primate and the other bishops. Bishop Campbell's sentiments with regard to certain USAGES which the non-jurors in England were endeavouring to revive were well known to the primate and to the other bishops in Scotland, and they "gave but a conditional and limited approbation" to his election. It was, however, a significant indication that the clergy of that large and important diocese were endeavouring to follow after catholic truth, as practised in primitive antiquity. As his assuming the administration of the diocese of Aberdeen appeared likely to involve him in controversy with his brethren, he declined to accept the prof-

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 41, 42.

² Skinner, ii. 630.—MS. *Memoirs*, 11.

ferred dignity, and therefore he “yielded his right in favour of bishop Gadderar¹.”

IN THE FIRST liturgy of Edward VI., published in the year 1549, there were primitive rites observed, involving important doctrines, which subsequent reformers of the Zuinglian school, in reviewing the Office for the Communion, struck out. The non-juring bishops of England thought they were not bound down by acts of parliament in their sacerdotal ministrations; and therefore they revived the rites which had been practised in the primitive church, and in their own times in Edward's time. These Usages, as they were now called, were—1st. To mix water with the wine. 2dly. To commemorate the faithful departed. 3dly. To consecrate the elements by an express invocation. 4thly. To use a prayer of oblation.—1. “Renouncing transubstantiation,” says bishop Jolly, “and the sacrifice of the mass, as it had been perverted to that strange sense in latter ages; instead of novel doctrine and practice, they constructed the office of the holy Eucharist [in the liturgy of 1549] according to the antient pattern, then seen in all churches of the world whose liturgies remain, retaining the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's body and blood shed for the sins of the world, represented according to his own institution, in bread and wine, the material Melchisedec. And into the wine, that liturgy ordered, as the whole church from the days of the apostles, a little salt and clean water to be poured, commemorative of the blood and water which flowed from our Redeemer's pierced side.” 2. The commemoration of those who have died in the faith is in the prayer for the church militant; it is not so fully pressed in the English communion office in our present Prayer Books, as it was in king Edward's. Perhaps no uninspired language can equal the words of commemoration in the English liturgy, where that which they wished to have done is accomplished². 3 and 4. All the ancient liturgies have an elevation of the elements to God, and a solemn invocation of the Holy Spirit, to make them the body and blood of Christ. In the office of 1549, “There was not a relic of the adjectitious matter of latter times left in it, reduced as it was to

¹ Skinner, ii. 630.—MS. Memoirs, 11, 12.

² The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist considered, as it is the Doctrine of Holy Scripture embraced by the Universal Church of the first and purest Times, by the Church of England, and by the Episcopal Church in Scotland. By the Right Rev. Alexander Jolly.

³ Vide *ante*, vol. i. ch. xiii. p. 549.

standard of primitive antiquity. The three parts of the consecration, to be seen in all the ancient liturgies, were restored; only the dislocation of them which the Latin church had made, so far remained, as that the invocation of the Holy Ghost, which in just order made the completion in those liturgies, was allowed to stand first, probably thinking it most devoutly pious to begin with such a prayer; whereas, following the words of institution and of solemn oblation, it served the most proper close; perfecting the consecration, and ending as a *guard and antidote* against the misinterpretation of our Saviour's words. Yet that prayer, as it was expressed in the first reformed book, plainly precluded the imagination of any change of *substance* by its supplicating for the sanctification of the bread and cup, not the change of them into a substantial body and blood—utterly incapable as they were of any additional sanctification, being already holy in infinite perfection. But it had been better to have restored the Invocation to its ancient place, as the third and consummating act of consecration, by the descent of the Holy Ghost on the elements¹.”

DURING HIS LIFE-TIME, bishop Hicke was of the party wishing to revive these usages, but he restrained his supporters from any undue heat or animosity, although much was debated on both sides. He died on the 15th December, 1715, universally allowed to have been a divine of great learning and of exemplary piety, as may be seen by the excellent works which he has left behind him². Dr. Collier, formerly lecturer at Gray's Inn, then became the senior bishop in that succession. He was a man of much warmth of temper and great extent of learning; he was supported by Dr. Brett, formerly rector of Westdean and Folkington. These now took the lead in this controversy, and pressed the restoration and reception of the four primitive points with great vigour and much strength of argument. The party who were opposed to them, and who were desirous of adhering to the communion office as it stands in the authorised Prayer Book, because it had received both a civil and an ecclesiastical sanction, was led by bishop Spincks, who had formerly been rector of St. Martin's, Sarum, curate of Stratford-subter-Cassey, and a prebendary of Sarum. The controversy became

¹ Jolly on the Eucharist, 119, 120.—The Authority and Use of the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated. By the Rev. P. Cheyne.—The Oblation and Institution in the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated, &c. By the Rev. James Christie.

² Salmon, ii. 56.

so warm that the two parties refused to communicate each other; and the champions on both sides agreed to sult the Scottish bishops, and to refer matters entirely to decision. Bishop Collier sent down Mr. Peck, in the 1718, to endeavour to persuade bishop Rose to convene a synod and to procure a decision in favour of the Usages. Bishop Spincks also wrote to the primate, to engage him on the same the authorised office. The primate declined giving any synodical decision on either side, but expressed his willingness to act as a mediator betwixt the contending parties, "recommending peace and forbearance of authority, till people's minds be cleared and properly disposed for a reception of these primitive practices." - The primate's own private opinions on this subject may be gathered from an extract of a letter to bishop Falconar dated May 22d, 1718 :—"As for my own part, seeing so much stress is laid upon these usages, I am very desirous of full information, being resolved, God willing, if I find it still necessary, to embrace them with all the disadvantages that may attend them; if only lawful, some way useful or desirable, prudence in such case, and in such cases only, ought to be consulted." Yet, says Mr. Skinner, "to testify their readiness [the primate and bishop Falconar] to do what they could for preventing a rupture among friends, they employed RATTRAY, of Craighall, in Perthshire, a man of superior knowledge in ecclesiastical literature, and who afterwards came to be a bright ornament to our church in another sphere, to draw up proposals of accommodation for reconciling these differences; which, at their request, he did with great candour and moderation, without entering critically on either side, but he well could, into the merits of the cause, but only wished both parties to condescend so far, for peace sake, as to communicate occasionally with one another in holy offices, according to the respective forms of them whose privilege it was to officiate at the time. This paper, though approved by bishop Rose as being 'written with much judgment, full of christian temper, and making much for peace,' yet, as the bishop felt, had the common fate of all such reconciling schemes, and gave the satisfaction intended by it, at the same time that the other party could find fault with it¹."

THE LOSS of her establishment had cast the church upon her own intrinsic powers, and the severe furnace of affliction and persecution which she had suffered for the last thirty years had disposed the minds of the clergy to seek after ca

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 622—625.

truth. And the fact of the Aberdeenshire clergy having elected bishop Campbell to be their diocesan, shews decidedly that their affections were pointing. The residence of bishops Campbell and Gadderar in London, and their intimacy with bishops Hickes, Collier, and Brett, made them zealous supporters of the Usages. At home, the primate seems to have wavered in his opinions, although at one time he had maintained the catholic side. Bishop Falconar, a man of a meek and quiet spirit, was decidedly in favour of the restoration of primitive usages. Bishop Millar was neutral—that is, he would comply with either party and communicate with both; bishop Irvine was vehemently opposed to the Usages. On several occasions he had carried him up to London in 1715, where, having contracted a friendship with bishop Spincks, to please him he undertook to secure the Scotch clergy from abetting the controverted points; and accordingly, on his return, he laboured most strenuously with bishop Rose to declare against him, and to join bishop Spincks; and though he failed in his attempts upon that wise and judicious prelate, yet his assiduity and arguments among the other clergy laid the foundation of all the disturbance that appeared about the Usages when bishop Rose died¹.”

THE FOLLOWING extract of a letter from bishop Falconar shews what were his sentiments respecting the Usages, and that the liturgy was in very general although not in universal use in the persecuted church of Scotland. He says, “he himself had administered with the *mixture* and by the Scotch Prayer Book *many years* backward; *long before* the dispute had commenced at London, and that he had approved the late bishop of Edinburgh of his way of doing; in which no remonstrance was made. That both he and his brethren approved and used the *invocation*, according to the example of bishop Rose, which was an innovation with respect to the English liturgy. That there were different rites of old, and before the reformation, and all without injury to unity. That an exact uniformity is hardly practicable, we ourselves being obliged to tolerate some clergy in their congregations, who use no other worship but such as is customary in this nation before the Revolution [*i. e.* *ex parte*], and would find ourselves under a necessity to con-
tinue at that way of doing, for some time at least, though Providence should favour the church so far as to turn the laws on its side.” And upon another occasion he spoke still more

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 628.

decidedly in a letter to the late primate, at the time when Mr. Peck came down on his mission from bishop Collier:—"I have reason to believe that these primitive usages, the restoring of which is so much laboured by these pious and learned persons, were *indeed* apostolical; they were delivered to us by men who contended for the faith once delivered to the saints, some of whom sealed that faith with their blood; who lived near the fountain head; who, under God, were the conveyancers of the Holy Scriptures to posterity; and who themselves also were endued with *charismata*. These qualifications state them most veracious and unexceptionable witnesses, and to think otherwise is, in my opinion, to sap the foundations, even to shake the credibility, of the blessed Scriptures themselves and of the church, the ground and pillar of truth. Hence it will follow that the restoration of them is most desirable, the rather that catholic unity (which to preserve when subsisting, and to restore when broken, is the indispensable duty of every christian, but chiefly of the governors of the church) cannot be established but on this primitive footing¹."

ALTHOUGH now the primate was lukewarm in the cause, being inclined for a while neither to favour nor forbid the usages, yet at one time he appears to have been on the catholic side. He had not seen Dr. Rattray's mediatorial paper, and was not personally acquainted with him, but he was desirous of seeing it; and on July 19th, he wrote to bishop Campbell—"since I am not sufficiently seen in the matter you write of, and that I know not wherein the stress of the point in dispute lies, I can give no opinion or advice anent it. But if you please to state the matter to me, and lay the whole *cardo controversiæ* before me, I will give you my opinion very freely of it, though my thoughts are not much to be regarded. Besides, I have small encouragement from the hopes of doing any good, to dip into an affair wherein you and Mr. Gadderar have travelled so much to so little purpose, to whose superior genius I humbly submit. And the greatest discouragement of all seems to arise from the unaccountable temper and humour of the persons with whom you have to do, since nothing will please them, but the practising such administrations as themselves acknowledge to be faulty, and that you must throw up all your demands, though they own them to be *desideranda*; which to me is most surprising²." Although it does not appear that the primate made any very active opposition to the practice of the primitive usages, yet he seems to have exerted a

¹ Skinner ii. 625, 626.

² Ibid. ii. 627.

sort of quiet influence against them. The author of the *Memoirs* says—"As this bishop [Campbell] was suspected to favour some, as they were called, usages of the ancient church, which had made a great noise in the nonjuring church in England, and *quite rent her*," the primate resolved to make some new consecrations to counteract the growing attachment of the clergy to the usages.

IN THE COURSE of this History since the Revolution, it has been perfectly evident that liturgical worship came immediately and spontaneously into use in this church as soon as it was relieved from the pressure of the state embraces; and it is to be regretted that the liturgy, which had received royal and episcopal sanction in 1687, had not been adopted. The poverty, not only of the church itself collectively, but of her individual members, prevented their publishing a new edition of it, and if they had it could not have been printed in Scotland. The age of bigotry and intolerance commenced with the ascendancy of the Solemn League and Covenant, and no printer or publisher dared to produce any work inimical to *the Cause*, more especially the liturgy, at which the presbyterians had the same instinctive dread as a mad dog has at water. It was, says Mr. Cheyne, "passed by, partly through necessity, partly through policy. There was, on the one hand, the fear of national prejudice, as well as the difficulty of obtaining copies of the work, and the inability of the people to purchase them; and on the other, the advantage, in every appeal to England against the violence of the presbyterian party, of being able to say that they were persecuted for reading the English liturgy, which was, indeed, no imaginary grievance, got up to serve the purpose of the moment. But even this trafficking with human policy brought its curse along with it, in the conditions of an act of toleration, which opened a door for irregularities, that have been a thorn in the sides of the church ever since, and are likely to be so for many days to come. The English liturgy, besides, came recommended by the facility by which it was obtained, through the liberality of charitable persons in England, foremost of whom may be mentioned queen Anne herself. In 1712, bishop Campbell, in a private letter to one of his friends, says—'we have a fair prospect of getting plenty of prayer-books for Scotland. I wish we had as good [a prospect] of leave to use them aright, and of maintenance for those that do.' By circumstances such as these did the English liturgy work its gradual way into use as the *daily* office of the Scottish church; but there existed at the same time longings for a higher and more catholic form

in the administration of the most holy eucharist; and the longings sought satisfaction—some in the use of the Scottish office of 1637, as bishop Falconar—others, in the addition the invocation to the English form of consecration, bishop Rose; till at last they formed to themselves a more complete development in the arrangement of bishop Gadder and we have seen how speedily that followed upon the introduction of liturgical worship into Scotland¹.”

THE ASSEMBLY met on the 11th of May, and was wholly occupied with their controversy on the “Marrow of Modern Divinity.” The commissioner was in such an ill state of health that he was obliged to shorten their sitting by several days, and in this act of supremacy the Assembly acquiesced. Most of the remaining business was referred to the commission; but this complaisance was blamed by many of the sincerest. As I find, says Wodrow, “some dislike our rising thus, *without asserting our power to sit without a commissioner*; but others see no ground for such an assertion, when Providence *cleared our way* by laying affliction on him. It had been cruelty to have pressed his being with us any longer; and it is a *miracle* we have a king who *countenances* us and a commissioner so long².” As usual, whenever presbytery became predominant the jesuits began actively to ply their craft, and to pick wandering sheep from the presbyterian fold. Wodrow says, “the accounts are most lamentable . . . Bishops, priests and jesuits, are exercising openly their functions; seminaries and schools are openly set up, and multitudes sent abroad and coming home from popish seminaries every three or four months³.” In the month of May, this year, a magistrate broke open the door of the duchess of Gordon’s house in the Canongate, and seized her grace and family, and about fifty individuals, with two priests, who were celebrating mass. The ladies were bailed, but the priests were committed to prison⁴.

1722.—AFTER THE DEATH of bishop Rose, the exiled prince, through the medium of Mr. Lockhart and some others, who were called his “Trustees,” began to exercise the regale from which the storms of the Revolution had emancipated the church. Lockhart contrived to exercise a considerable degree of influence over the bishops; and with some dexterity of management, he contrived to get them to admit of James’s *commissaire d’élire*. Some time previously he had advised James to commend Mr. David Freebairn to be consecrated as one of the

¹ Cheyne’s Vindication, 36-37.

² Correspondence, ii. 583.

³ Correspondence, ii. 583.

⁴ Ibid. 640.

college of bishops, and he now says, "Whereas the king [meaning James] had not long ago named Mr. Freebairn to be a bishop, and directed that he should be consecrated. I acquainted Mr. Murray [James's secretary of state] that this step was not agreeable to, and approved by, the clergy, both on account of the person named and the manner of doing it—that, though he was not under any bad character, they did not think him adorned with those qualifications of learning, good sense, and the like, so necessary in one of that station, and that he was in no reputation among his brethren, or the laity of his communion; that as the king, at the distance he was, and from the little knowledge and experience he had of private men's characters and circumstances, could not judge thoroughly, so as to be sure of making a right choice, it was hoped that before he proceeded to a nomination he would have consulted the bishops; that as this method would prevent his making a bad choice, it would endear him much to the clergy, and be attended with this further benefit, that it would prevent his being solicited and obliged perhaps to give denials; for were it known that he made no such promotions but by the advice and approbation of the bishops, people would apply to them before they presumed to teaze him with solicitations. And I therefore recommended to Mr. Murray to lay this before the king, adding, withal, that he was so much the more bound to do so, in regard he was generally blamed for having advised the king with this step¹."

THE EXILED PRINCE, however, did not find this shadow of regal power always so readily obeyed as he and his mischievous trustee desired, and Lockhart again writes—"I took notice before, that the king, soon after the bishop of Edinburgh's death, sent directions for having Mr. Freebairn consecrated, but as the other bishops did not approve of this choice, they delayed his consecration, some of them being obstinately bent against him, both on account of his own character, and the way and manner of the king's naming him. At the same time, as the king had in his letter required of them that they should acquaint him previous to any future promotions, and that they thought it expedient to have it in their power to add to their number as the service of the church required, either by the death of any of the present number, or because of the divisions that they foresaw were like to happen, they writ to the king to desire his approbation of promoting Mr. Cant and Mr. Lammie, and obtained it. But as Freebairn was ex-

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 49, 50.

tremely fond of the honour designed him, and could not with patience bear a delay, he, or his son, then at Rome, represented to the king that the delay proceeded from an unwillingness in the bishops to approve his taking upon him to name those that were to be bishops of the church, which the king took very ill, seeming noways inclined to part with his right and privilege of the crown ; and care was taken to let the bishops and his trustees know that *he expected obedience*. This put the bishops to a stand, and they resolved to advise with the trustees, who, finding that Freebairn had made no secret of his promotion, and fearing the performance, which probably could not be concealed, might provoke the government and do harm at this juncture, they thought it proper to delay the same, and directed me to write the following letter to the king, dated March 12, 1722 :—

“ SOME considerable time ago you was pleased to name three persons to be bishops, and sent directions for their consecration. The college of bishops, in obedience thereto, met frequently, but were always prevented from executing your orders, for reasons that to them seemed unanswerable ; but one of the three [Freebairn] not being satisfied with the delay, and pressing to be consecrated with the greatest earnestness and anxiety imaginable, the college was again lately convened, in order to put some end or other to the matter ; when, taking into their consideration that from the present state of the times, it was matter of no small importance, and that a great deal of caution and prudence was requisite in a matter of that nature, and reflecting, withal, that the interests of the church and state are so blended together as to become reciprocal, they thought fit to ask the advice of such of your trustees to whom they could have access, and before they took any positive resolutions. And having accordingly laid the affair fully before the duke of Hamilton, the lords Wigton, Kincardine, Balmerino, and Dunn, Mr. Maule, and Mr. Patterson, they all, with one consent and assent, agreed, and gave it as their opinion and advice, that the consecration of any more bishops in the present state and circumstances of affairs (especially seeing the number in being was sufficient in all respects for the business committed to them) would be prejudicial to your service and the interests of the church, and probably occasion much trouble and many difficulties ; and that, therefore, a delay should be made therein, until either you signified your express commands to the contrary, or the death of any of the present bishops, or a *happy scheme and turn of affairs*, gave

them reason to think and act with other views. And as they are all very well assured that your sole intention in the aforesaid nomination was to promote the true and solid interests of your people, they hope you will not misconstrue their proceedings, formed by the best advice, on grounds to them convincingly apparent, to be suitable to your and the church's interest at this critical juncture. This, in general, I was desired to represent, and withal to beg you would, according to your wonted goodness, admit of no interpretation that may give you the least disgust at what is done with a sincere intention for your service and the interest you have so much at heart."

IT IS PAINFUL to observe the vile, abject, secular spirit which the long predominant principles of erastianism had fostered, both in the trustees and in the prelates, which this letter exhibits. The bishops actually hugged the chains with erastian affection that the Revolution had knocked off their manacled limbs; thus putting their trust in princes, and betraying the rights of the church, which they were now in a position to assert. If the church had placed her full trust and affiance on Christ, who is the HEAD of the body, she needed not to have feared even what the king in possession could have done, far less the unfortunate exile who was without even the shadow of real power. But the bishops stood in awe of this representative of a family that may number among their sins their many acts of oppression to the church by the deprivation of her bishops, but who had not now the slightest power either to further or to obstruct the work of God, which the bishops were called to set forward. But in truth, the fallacious hope of a restoration was the spring of all their acts at this time—a college of bishops was formed without dioceses, with the evident view of their being appointed to the ancient legal bishopricks after the wished-for restoration should take place. In the meantime the royal exile exercised the regale so that none but the favourites of Lockhart and his own trustees might enjoy the royal promotion on that event.

TO THE ABOVE communication an answer was received, dated May 9, 1722:—"As to what you say about the bishops, I never imagined there could be any difficulty about the consecration in respect of the present conjuncture, since two of the three were actually proposed to me by friends in your party. If there be any personal objection against any of them, it is fit I should know it; and as I have no other view

but the common good in meddling with those matters, I sh^d be far from expecting that any thing should be done in the that may be made appear to me to be prejudicial to it¹."

MR. SALMON says, that on the 13th of April "the reverend Dr. Charles Leslie, a non-juring divine, died at his own house in the north of Ireland, his native country. He was second son of John Leslie, bishop of Clogher, in that kingdom. At the Revolution he was chancellor of the cathedral at Connor and left that and his other ecclesiastical preferments to follow king James's fortunes, and, after his death, his son's, and made several visits to the court of St. Germain's and Bar-le-duc, which, with his writings, having rendered him obnoxious to the government in the year 1713, he found himself under necessity of leaving the kingdom, and retiring to the Chevalier's Court, where he was allowed to officiate in a private chapel, after the rites of the church of England." He went with the prince into Italy, and took much pains to convert him to the true Catholic faith, but to no purpose, for he found him to be impreguably entrenched behind the bigotry and superstition of his creed. He became at last convinced that James "was a weak and incorrigible bigot, though in every thing but religion an amiable and accomplished man. The Pretender promised to hear what he had to represent on the subject of religion, but he was far from keeping the word which he had given him, and on the faith of which he had gone over to him. He not only refused to hear Leslie himself, but sheltered the ignorance of his priests, or the badness of the cause, or both, behind his authority, and absolutely forbade discourse concerning religion." Leslie therefore determined to die in his own bed, and in his own house; so returning to London, he received a protection from lord Sunderland, and then proceeded to his paternal house and property of Glasclough in the county of Monagan, where he died².

A PROCLAMATION was issued, stating that his majesty had received repeated and unquestionable advices, that several of his subjects had entered into a wicked conspiracy, in concert with traitors abroad, for raising a rebellion in this kingdom, in favour of a popish pretender. And another for putting the laws in execution against papists and non-jurors; for commanding all papists, and reputed papists, to depart from the cities of London and Westminster, and from within ten miles of the same; and for confining papists, and reputed papists

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 76-82.

² Salmon's Chronology, ii. 122—Episcopal Magazine, ii. 436. August, 18

to their habitations; and for putting in execution the laws against riots and rioters. On the 16th of November the king sent a message to the House of Peers, importing that many of the exiled prince's Declarations had been dispersed in England; the original, signed JAMES REX, was ordered to be laid before the house. The peers resolved that the said declaration "was a false, insolent, and traitorous libel; full of arrogance and presumption, in supposing the Pretender in a condition to offer terms to his majesty, &c." And they ordered the copy of the Declaration to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman. Yong T'ching, the emperor of China, on ascending the throne, banished the jesuits, and all other popish missionaries, and imprisoned all his subjects that refused to renounce christianity. Before this reign there were nearly two hundred christian churches in China, and several of the jesuits were ministers and officers in the Chinese court. It was their quarrelling with the missionaries of other orders, and endeavouring to render them odious to the Chinese, that chiefly occasioned their expulsion. "Their insinuating that the pope was superior to all earthly powers, and ought to be obeyed rather than their temporal sovereigns, has made all the Asiatic princes cautious how they admit the Latin christians into their dominions¹."

THE PRIMATE at last yielded to the external influence now practised on the church to advance Mr. Andrew Cant and Mr. David Freebairn to the episcopate. The former was the son of the famous covenanter and minister at Aberdeen, and who had joined in the effort to establish general assemblies in the primacy of archbishop Sharp; the latter had been incumbent of Dunning, in Perthshire, but ejected at the Revolution. Some, says Mr. Skinner, "of the ejected clergy, had brought along with them as much of the old secular attachment as to retain the fond notion that the church could not subsist without acknowledging the same dependence, and paying the same respects and submissions, which, in times past of legal settlement, she had been accustomed to. In all the promotions hitherto, since the Revolution, there had been no such thing thought of. The principle by which the bishops acted, was, that adventitious donations from the state, and grateful concessions from the church, were reciprocal; and that, consequently, as bishop Falconar expresses it in one of his letters, when the church is under destitution of secular encouragement, whether voluntary or involuntary, she may and should

¹ Salmon, 123, 129, 131.

betake herself to her own intrinsic powers. But soon after bishop Rose's death, it was advised, by friends of a certain denomination, that the long dormant privilege should be revived, and ecclesiastical prerogative interposed, not indeed in express terms of the old form, but simply by way of recommendation, which it was thought would be less offensive, *and equally effectual*¹."

THE PRIMATE, assisted by bishops Millar and Irvine, consecrated, in Edinburgh, Mr. Cant and Mr. Freebairn on the 17th October, being the day before St. Luke's-day. The primate and bishop Falconar were dissatisfied with these promotions by the exiled prince, or rather by his meddling representative, Mr. Lockhart; they saw no necessity for this secular interference, and anticipated evil results from it, yet they had not the firmness to resist such visible and unwarrantable encroachments upon the freedom of the church². "The letter," says Lockhart, "formerly mentioned, with regard to the persons the king had recommended to the bishops, being communicated to the bishop of Edinburgh, and by him to his brethren, prevailed with them to proceed immediately to consecration, after which I wrote. . . . As soon as I got your letter in summer last, I went and shewed the paragraph to the bishops Fullarton, Millar, and Irvine, and pressed them to lose no time in performing what *you expected* from them. These I found all along very frank; but another of the college, bishop Falconar (a man of great piety, learning, and loyalty), was so afraid [and justly] of the rights of the church, that he scrupled at your recommending Mr. Freebairn . . . and to convince him that even that power would be tenderly used, and in such a manner as no real prejudice could arise from them, I laid before the bishops a part of a copy of a letter I received from you a good time ago, wherein you commanded me to acquaint them, that it was your intention, for the future, not to name any to be consecrated until you had the opinion and advice of the bishops with regard to the qualifications and characters of the persons³." This gave them all infinite satisfaction, and they desired me, very lately, to acquaint you, that if any person hath represented that they delayed this affair out of disrespect to your pleasure, a very great injury was done them, and that such representations must either proceed from gross igno-

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 641.

² Skinner, ii. 641—MS. Memoirs, 12—Primitive Truth and Order. Appendix, 521—List of Consecrations affixed to Address to Archbishop Seabury, 38—Perceval's Apology, 254.

³ Lockhart Papers, ii. 93, 94, dated December 7, 1722.

rance, or a malicious design to give you a bad impression of them: that as they have hitherto given evident proofs of their loyalty, they are determined, in all their actions, to behave as becomes good and obedient subjects; and that they have, to the satisfaction of the inferior clergy, consecrated Cant and Freebairn, and are sorry they could not prevail with Lammie to accept, as he was a person in many respects more capable than perhaps any other to have been useful in that station to you and the church's interests.

"THOUGH THIS affair is now adjusted, there is another in the field. . . . You have heard, no doubt, of some contests of late years amongst the non-juring English clergy, concerning some alterations that some of the members desired in the liturgy and forms of worship, which were driven so far as to occasion a great breach among them, to the no small prejudice and discredit of the whole party. Of those who set up for alterations, two of our Scots bishops, Campbell and Gadderar, made a considerable figure at London, where they have resided these many years, and as the clergy, of all mankind, are most zealous to propagate and establish their own schemes, Gadderar, on an invitation from some people of note, is lately come to Edinburgh, in order to his going north, and heading that party. There have been several meetings of the bishops, and all but Falconar and Gadderar are against all alterations or innovations, until the church and state are so happily restored and settled, that such matters can be duly considered, and *legally* determined. . . . Fullarton, and those of his sentiments, taking this affair much to heart, desired the advice of such of your trustees as could be got conveniently together at Edinburgh; and by these I was, t'other day, directed to attend a full meeting of the college. Both parties endeavoured, by the practice of the Fathers and the first ages of the church, to justify themselves; but I stopt them short, and told them, it was none of my province to judge of such points; that I was directed to wait upon them, and in your name to recommend unity and harmony, and to avoid every thing that might give you and their enemies a handle to calumniate them; and in order thereto, that they singly would give that obedience to the college of bishops which they expected from the laicks, and which, indeed, they could not contradict, without at the same time oppugning your authority, as the *College of Bishops derived their present power of governing the church from you* [!]. . . . After having said a great deal to shew the bad effects of divisions at this juncture, Falconar and Gadderar professed a great deal of loyalty and zeal for you, and hoped

you would not misconstrue their endeavours to accomplish what had no manner of concern with the state, or even the external government of the church. I replied, that as the consequences of what they aimed at would affect both church and state, you had an immediate concern to interfere, and which I, as authorised by those you trusted with the management of your affairs, did accordingly do; and I required them, as they would be answerable to you for all the bad effects that would follow, to move no farther till at least your pleasure was known to them. At these words I saw they were moved, and seemed very desirous that no account should be sent to you. I told them I would give them no satisfaction in that matter, for that depended on your trustees, and they, I believed, would regulate that matter as they saw the bishops behaved. Mr. Fullarton next day informed me, that what I had represented had made an impression on them, though he was afraid it would be hard to bring them to reason. . . . As nothing is omitted to keep these people within reason, I am hopeful they will at last *succumb*; but should it be otherwise, I do verily believe the least intimation from you that you do not approve of these steps at this season, will at least have such influence with the laity, that few converts will be made, and thereby discourage the undertaking¹."

THE SECULAR spirit which thus afflicted the church is evident from the foregoing letter. The hope of the restoration of the old dynasty was strong in the minds of the bishops, and they yielded the same obedience to the regale in the abeyance of the legal exercise of it, as they knew they would have been obliged to have done had James been restored to the throne of his ancestors. Lockhart, too, bullied them, and shook an imaginary rod over the heads of men who held their power, as he asserted, from the royal exile, to govern the church.

THE COLLEGE scheme was a mere political movement, recommended to some of the bishops by those secular motives by which many of them were actuated, and encouraged therein by the ambitious views of Lockhart. But the primate, with bishops Falconar, Campbell, and Gadderar, were decidedly disposed to encourage the regular system of diocesan superintendence. Whatever might be bishop Campbell's motives for residing in London, whether of greater ease or of more emolument, it is certain that he never visited his diocese of Aberdeen, to which he had been elected in 1721. Nevertheless he was desirous of still retaining it; and he sent bishop Gad-

¹ Lockhart Papers, 93-97.

er down as his vicar. To this arrangement the primate interposed his objections, and the trustees of the exiled prince cordially supported him; for diocesan episcopacy spoiled all Lockhart's plans. Bishop Gadderar was proposed at the same time when bishop Campbell was elected by the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen; and, to avoid disputes, or any difference with the bishop of Edinburgh, they now elected bishop Gadderar to be their diocesan, but to reside within his diocese. On his arrival the clergy of Aberdeen gladly received him, and promised canonical obedience; and they professed their entire satisfaction in all they knew of his principles and practices respecting the usages. This is a most decisive indication of their favour for the restitution of the primitive rites of the catholic church, before they were corrupted by the additions of popery. Unhappily, however, the bishops were at this time divided in their sentiments, both on the subject of the usages and also of diocesan jurisdiction. The author of the Manuscript Memoirs, says,—“All these bishops, dreading the fatal consequences of too warmly contending for, and opposing the introduction of these usages, from what had happened in England; and the noise raised here in Scotland about these usages, was thus:—Bishop Irvine had promised to bishop Spincks, in London, to keep the Scots clergy from joining or abetting some usages of the ancient church, the most generally received of which was the mixing of water with the wine in the holy eucharist. When bishop Gadderar came to Scotland, in the year 1722, bishop Irvine had the interest to raise a hue and cry against the usages, at a time when no presbyter in the kingdom was attempting to introduce any such things into the public worship; and not only to raise the noise, but to advise the draft of a formula, to be subscribed by every presbyter, obliging themselves, as in the presence of God, never to practise any of the usages. Several presbyters, throughout the nation, boggled at this formula, not so much from any intention they had to practise the usages, as from an inward conviction that these usages had been the practice of the ancient church long before popery came to be introduced¹.”

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met on the 10th of May; the earl of Loudon was sent down as the commissioner. There is nothing in the king's speech, or the reply to it, that requires to be noticed; but in their address to the king they make a most

¹ MS. Memoirs, 13.

dolorous complaint of the increase of popery, and of the activity and boldness of priests and jesuits in “diffusing their poison.” They ascribe this in part “to the great extent of the northern country, the *small number of churches* [in the presbyterian interest], and the utter inactivity of inferior judges in executing the laws against popery.” Now this is a confession of the strength of episcopacy in the north; for there was no diminution of the *number* of churches, but so many of them were still in possession of the episcopal clergy whom, on account of the attachment of the people, they had not yet been able to eject, that they attempted this species of imposition on the king. They do not mention the episcopal clergy in their address, but they allude to them under the designation of “inexcusable protestants,” and connect them with “those unnatural and traitorous conspiracies” denounced in the king’s proclamation¹. The kirk was still rent in twain by two headstrong and inveterate parties on the orthodoxy of the Marrow of Modern Divinity, or, as it was familiarly termed, “the marrow.” “After a period of protracted and anxious discussion, an act was framed, but at the same time confirming the former act; giving a cautious but not very orthodox statement of the doctrines held by the church on the points under discussion; prohibiting the ministers of the church from teaching the positions condemned, or any equivalent to them, and appointing the moderator to rebuke and admonish the twelve brethren who signed the representation.” They were rebuked accordingly; but in the true spirit of presbyterianism, the rebuked brethren immediately laid a protest upon the table against both the former act and the present sentence, asserting their full liberty to profess, teach, and bear testimony to the truths condemned².”

1723.—AFTER REPEATED prorogations, the English convocation met formally as usual, on the 23d of January, but with that instinctive apprehension of the exiled dynasty which governed the house of Hanover in their lordship over the church, the crown prorogued it to the 29th of March, and then to the Greek calends. It has never since been suffered to sit or to transact business, except a formal meeting, like the ghosts of the departed hovering over those haunts which they had loved in life, to prepare and present an address to the reigning sovereign. In May the British parliament laid a tax on papists and non-jurors in England, and passed an act to

¹ Acts of Assembly, 543—560.

² Hetherington’s History, 207.

blige papists and non-jurors in Scotland to register their states¹.

IN THE BEGINNING of February the presbyterian minister of Peterhead, writing in reply to Wodrow, says, "I am grieved to hear of the *vast number* of meeting-houses you tell me of. We were in hopes the rebellion would have eased you in part of that burthen; but it seems *growing*. Let me know which of them use the English service, and whether generally, as I suppose they are, they be non-jurors." And Wodrow himself, writing to a friend in Rotterdam, says, "The meeting-houses are growing much in the north, and a spacious one is built at Aberdeen, for the English service, by contribution from England." And again, to his wife, he says, "the jacobites are still uppish in the north, and popery and disaffection increasing²."

THERE WAS a meeting of the college of bishops at Edinburgh, on the 2d of February; at which, however, the meek and gentle bishop Falconar was not present, nor Gadderar, the stern and fearless bishop of Aberdeen. Bishop Irvine, who was faithful to his promise to bishop Spincks, and seems to have been, if not a creature of the laird of Carnwath's, at least completely under his influence, prevailed on the meeting to adopt and publish a remonstrance and injunction which he had prepared, addressed "to the episcopal church of Scotland, as well clergy as laity, exhorting and obtesting them all to shun those fatal rocks whereon others have been shipwrecked before; and requiring the clergy in particular to forbear the mixture and other obsolete usages, and to avoid the being accessory to the breaking the peace of the church, and the incurring our just and necessary censure³;" of which the following is a copy:—

"UNTO THE episcopal church of Scotland, as well clergy as laity, the plurality of the college of bishops, who have the inspection and superintendence of the said church, send greeting: The peace and unity of this national church is a matter of so great importance to us and to all who wish well to religion, that we cannot think, without horror and the utmost detestation, of allowing any thing to be brought forward to the doctrine or worship of this church that tends in the least to separate or divide us. Which was the reason why

¹ Salmon's Chronological Historian, 131—136.

Wodrow's Correspondence, iii. 13—42—45.

² Skinner, ii. 621.

we refused to give our consent to some of our brethren there, practising in the public worship some Usages—such as the mixing of water with the wine in the celebration of the holy eucharist, praying for the dead¹, and some others which the godly and learned divines, pious confessors, and holy martyrs, who compiled the Liturgy *which now we use*, thought fit and expedient, upon the review thereof, to keep out and lay aside; none of the divines at that time expressing any dissatisfaction thereat, or murmuring against the want of these Usages: and seeing the unreasonable reviving and pressing of these Usages by an incompetent authority have broken and divided our brethren in England, and cannot miss to have the same fatal effect if they are in the same unwarrantable manner introduced among us. Wherefore these are earnestly to exhort and obtest in the bowels of Jesus Christ, all of you our dear friends carefully to shun these fatal rocks whereon others have been shipwrecked before you. And for this purpose we judge it meet to lay it before you, our reverend brethren of the clergy, for refreshing of your memories, that at your ordination, conform to the ordinal, you promised solemnly to maintain and set forward, as much as lies in you, quietness, peace, and love among all christian people, and especially among them that are or shall be committed to your charge; to which promise your reviving of these Usages at this unseasonable time is not reconcileable.

“YOU ALSO FARTHER promised, in that same ordinal by which you were ordained, to give faithful diligence always to minister the doctrine and sacraments as the Lord hath commanded, and as this church and realm [of England] have received the same. Now the church and realm mentioned in the said ordinal did and do still minister the doctrine and sacraments without these Usages, in the same manner as we do at present. And if you will keep faithfully to that religious promise which

¹ In commemoration of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and of all the saints who have pleased God in their several generations from the beginning of the world; and for rest, light, and peace, and a blessed resurrection, and a merciful trial in the “Day of the Lord,” to all the faithful departed. “And accordingly prayers for the dead, especially at the altar, had always been the practice of the catholic church from the beginning, nor was there ever any ancient liturgy without them; and Tertullian testifies that it was an *immemorial* practice in his time; which will carry it up to the apostolic age itself, since he lived within a hundred years of the last surviving apostles; and it therefore must certainly have been derived from them, as it was then believed to be, and it is plainly founded on Scripture doctrine.”—Some Instructions concerning the Christian Covenant, &c. by the Right Rev. Thomas Rattray, Lord Bishop of Dunkeld, p. 24, 25.

you made to God and his church on so solemn an occasion, hence ye will forbear the mixture and the foresaid Usages, and be incurring our just and necessary censure.

“SO GREAT WAS our condescending care, that it induced us to indulge our scrupulous brethren in the use of the communion office as in our Scottish Liturgy, hoping thereby to prevent all further disturbance. But seeing neither this nor their own express passing from the absolute and indispensable necessity of these said usages can restrain them from such measures as do plainly tend to rend and destroy this afflicted church, we have found it necessary to issue out this our loving remonstrance and injunction. Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind. Live in peace, and the God of peace shall be with you. (*Sic subscribitur*) — John, bishop of Edinburgh; Arthur Millar, bishop; William Irvine, bishop; Andrew Cant, bishop; David Freebairn, bishop. Given at Edinburgh, February 12th, 1723¹.”

AT THE SAME time that the synod issued the above address, they also sent the following formula to be signed and returned to their respective bishops:—

“AT EDINBURGH, the 11th day of February, 1723. — The bishop of Edinburgh having convened his clergy, and laid before them the present danger of the church, and that her peace and unity is like to be broken by the endeavours of some to introduce certain usages, such as mixture of water with the wine in the celebration of the holy eucharist, prayers for the dead, &c., and some others; we whose names are underwritten do faithfully declare and promise that the preserving the peace and unity of the church (which to all good men ought to be very dear and precious), we shall not make any innovation in the doctrine and worship of this church, as now received among us, by introducing or practising any of the said usages.”—*Sic subscribitur, &c.*²

BISHOP FALCONAR was most willing to concur with his brethren in any measure that might promote peace and unity in the church of Scotland; but the proceedings of this synod gave him great uneasiness, and filled him with sorrowful apprehension for the future. In a letter to the Rev. Robert Keith, dated March 6th, among other matters he writes, “As long

¹ Copy from a MS. communicated by a friend; also, MS. Mem.

² MS. Memoirs, p. 61.

as governors hold to that golden rule, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, and, in case of exorbitant innovations, endeavour with a spirit of meekness to deliver their flocks from these wrong thoughts which have impressed them and taken hold of their passions, they act their duty; but if they do otherwise their account is great, and temporising in favour of *popular* humour will not bear at the day when it will be examined whether they have pleased men or God. I know some reckon nothing an imposition but affirmatives; but negatives, for ought I know, are also impositions—witness prohibiting the cup to the laity, forbidding the public worship in the vernacular tongue, &c. I heartily wish my brethren had not grounded their manifesto on the reason of these usages being obsolete and antiquated, seeing this will stand in bar to all reformations of principles and practices that are inveterate and have long obtained. Geneva and the numerous foreign bodies may fully as reasonably plead this against episcopacy, liturgy, &c. It may be pleaded also by the majority of the Scottish nation now, against many things that are helped to the better since the Revolution, and might have been boggled at as obsolete and antiquated by our people, who should be gently led into a due regard to their superiors, and not to prescribe rules to them which seems to be the cause of that great zeal which the bishops shew against the ancient usages.” And in the conclusion, having mentioned some other primitive things which he wished were introduced, but which he says “the invidious names innovation and popery always knock on the head and put a stop to,” he has this notable observation:—“The clearest view we can have of these things is the pure primitive church; and I am apt to think that God has laid His *rod* on the back of this church, to bring about *such a blissful reform*; and I despair of the removal of this rod till this be brought about, if not to ripeness, yet at least in wish and endeavour¹.”

MR. RATTRAY, however, replied to their address and formula more elaborately, as follows. It is copied from the original document in his own hand-writing, which was found among the late bishop Jolly's papers. It is intitled, “Some Remarks on the Circular Letter of the Edinburgh Bishops.”

“THIS LETTER is directed to the episcopal church of Scotland, as if there were, or could be, another church in it, which is not episcopal; whereas, according to St. Ignatius “*without these* (viz. the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and

¹ Skinner, ii. 631, 32.

deacons) *it is not called a church*¹. And S. Cyprian's definition of a church is—the people united to their priest, and the flock adhering to its pastor. From whence he infers—Therefore you ought to know that a bishop is, necessarily, in a church; and that the church exists in its bishop. But it seems they have more favourable thoughts of our presbyterian constitutions, so as to allow them to be churches, though they may think them less perfect ones; otherwise there would have been no need for this distinction, and it would have been sufficient to have directed to the church, or rather, in the plural number, churches, of Scotland, or to the catholic church which is in Scotland, according to the primitive manner; or rather to the presbyters and deacons and all the people of the church of Scotland, which is more proper when the bishops write to the inferior clergy and people only; since the word church includes the bishop himself. (See the inscriptions of the 38, 39, and 40 epistles of St. Cyprian). But this they did not perhaps like so well, because it is primitive; the very sign of this letter being to discharge some of the primitive ages of the catholic church.

“THEY CALL themselves the plurality of the college of bishops, who have the inspection and superintendency of the said church. But how bishops at large, who have no title to any particular diocese or district in Scotland, as not being canonically elected thereto, can have any superintendency over the national church of Scotland, so as to challenge the obedience of the clergy and people (since a national church is made up of particular dioceses or districts, that is, of particular churches, and the particular bishops thereof, as heads and principles of unity to the particular churches), it concerns them to shew from the nature of ecclesiastical government, or from any practice or precedent of the primitive catholic church. A bishop at large may indeed perform episcopal acts in a vacant diocese, but they cannot challenge the obedience of the clergy and people of that diocese antecedently to a canonical election. They will, perhaps, pretend to govern the church of Scotland in common, as if it were only one district, and all of them equally bishops of it; but how will they reconcile this with that primitive catholic maxim that there can be but *unus episcopus in una ecclesia* [one bishop in one church]; which is a fundamental principle of ecclesiastical government? I know, indeed, that there is one of them, who was elected, not to the whole diocese of Edinburgh, but only to the district in and about

¹ Ep. ad Trall. § 3, Ep. 65, p. 168.

Edinburgh, by the joint concurrence of his colleagues the clergy and people of that district; but then to empower him to challenge the obedience of any bishop who live within that district. And if they shall make a new division of this national church into districts as to allot a particular district to each of them, it ought to satisfy us how their doing this, without the consent of the clergy and people of these districts, is agreeable to the principles of the primitive catholic church, as we are represented in a synodical epistle of the African bishops of the year 254,—‘as they (the people) chiefly have the power of selecting worthy priests, or of rejecting those who are unworthy. Which institution we perceive also to be derived from the divine authority; that in the presence of the whole church in the view of all—a priest shall be selected, and if he is worthy and suitable, by the public judgment and consent, his election shall be confirmed. Wherefore, both from tradition and apostolic practice, that rule is diligently observed and maintained, (as, indeed, by us, and by all provinces, it is maintained) that, for the right order of ordination, the bishops nearest to the vacant province shall assemble with that people for whom a bishop is to be chosen, and, in the presence of those who have most fully known the lives of the candidates, and have been witnesses of their actions and conversation, the bishop shall be chosen. It is also, that this order was observed in the ordination of Sabinus. For his bishoprick was bestowed on him by the suffrages of the whole brotherhood, and by the judgment, both of the bishops, who were present, and of the people who sent letters to you concerning him.’ And thus, indeed, a tradition derived from the apostles, we are assured even by the apostolical Clemens, and by the canon of Rome, in whose name he writes his epistle to the church of Alexandria in the very year after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, the 44th sect. of which he saith, the apostles having the forementioned . . . (viz. bishops and deacons, &c.) afterwards established a second law concerning the succession (see Wotton’s note on the place, and Mr. Dodwell’s pp. 35 and 36), that if any of them should die, other persons might succeed in their ministry, and that this should be done (by celebrated men, with the consent and approbation of the whole church). So much for the inscription; I leave the letter itself.

“THAT THE PEACE and unity of the church is a ma

great importance, is agreed on all hands. But then the question is, whether this be the way to preserve it? Or if it be not rather a plain violation of it? And whether even peace itself may not be too dearly bought? Whether peace and truth ought not always to go together? Or whether it be lawful to sacrifice truth to the interests of peace? But,

"THEY SAY, 'that they cannot therefore think, without horror and the utmost detestation, of allowing any thing to be brought into the doctrines or worship of this church, that tends in the least to separate or divide us.' But before they can justly vindicate even this, they ought to shew that there is nothing material in either, wherein this church is corrupt or defective; otherwise this might with as good a grace come from the mouth of popish or Greek bishops: and, if allowable, no church, how corrupt or defective soever in doctrine or worship, can ever be reformed: and at this rate, we ought still to have continued in our old extemporary way, and in the neglect of that necessary and sacred rite of confirmation; the introducing of a liturgy being what a great many of our clergy, as well as the generality of the common people, were more averse to than they are to those primitive usages; and if they had been the same way allowed and encouraged in it, would have raised much greater clamours than they have done on this occasion; so that if the same method, which was then used, had been taken in this case, it would undoubtedly have had the same success; since the proofs we have for them are every whit as evident as those which we have for a liturgy in general: nor could they have any reason to fear, that the permitting of these primitive usages, to such as were desirous to use them, or even the encouraging or recommending the practice of them, while they were not imposed on any person, could ever have tended to separate or divide us. Some, indeed, might have used them, and others not, at least for a time, as in the case of introducing the liturgy, but while neither of them were allowed to condemn the other, or reckon themselves as opposite communions, this could never have occasioned a schism; especially in a church which is not tied to the use of any particular form by any established canons.

"YET THIS is the only reason they give, 'why they refused to give their consent to some of their brethren their practising in the public worship, these primitive usages.' By their brethren here, I suppose they mean their brethren of the episcopal college, and those seniors to all of them, save one. This is, indeed, a new way of preventing schisms, diametrically opposite to the principles upon which the unity of the primitive

church in the best and earliest ages was established ; as appears from what St. Cyprian says in opening the famous council of Carthage, consisting of no less than eighty-nine bishops assembled on that very important question concerning the invalidity of the baptism of heretics:—‘ It now remains that we deliver each his own sentiments concerning this matter, judging nobody, nor including any one, who may think differently, from the right of communion ; for no one of us hath established himself bishop of the bishops ; nor does any one seek to compel the assent of his colleagues by tyrannical fear. For every bishop, by the liberty and powers of his office, is permitted to exercise his private judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he can judge others. But let us all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone hath power, both to advance us in the government of his church, and to judge all our actions.’ Here we see that even the majority of a council of bishops have no power to compel any of their colleagues into their measures, if of a different judgment from them, even in a thing of so great importance as this, and that their attempting to do so would by [be] tyrannical, and a making of themselves bishops of bishops ; than which nothing was then thought more absurd ; it being no less than to assume that power which Christ has reserved to himself alone ; who hath given to every bishop the right of individual judgment in accordance with the liberty and power of his office, so as that he no more can be judged by others, than himself can judge others. Agreeably to which he tells pope Stephen, Ep. 72—‘ But we know that some are unwilling to forsake what they have once imbibed, and do not easily change their purpose ; but, although maintaining the bond of peace and harmony with their colleagues, still retain some peculiarities which have been once adopted by them. In which case, we neither employ force, nor prescribe laws to any one ; seeing that every governor hath the free exercise of his own will in the administration of his church, as being bound to render an account of his actions to God.’ So, likewise, Firmilian, in his Ep. to St. Cyprian, Ep. 75—‘ For in most other provinces also, there is much variety, arising from the difference of places and names, yet there hath not at any time been a departure from the peace and unity of the catholic church on this account. Which evils Stephen hath now dared to introduce, breaking against you that peace, which his predecessors maintained with you with mutual love and honour.’ And what the consequence of pope Stephen’s imposing and breaking peace with his colleagues for such differences was, Firmilian

roundly tells him, as it were addressing his discourse to him—
 An angry man begetteth strife, and a wrathful man increaseth
 in. For how great strifes and dissensions hast thou caused
 through the churches of the whole world; and how greatly
 hast thou increased thine own sin, seeing that thou hast rent
 thy bond of union with so many flocks! For therein thou
 woundest thyself. Be not deceived; for he is truly a schismatic
 who hath separated himself from the communion of ecclesi-
 astical unity.’ Thus if any schism shall happen by their thus
 unwarrantably imposing on their colleagues, they may plainly
 see where the guilt of it will lie, according to the principles
 of the primitive catholic church. Accordingly, Eusebius also
 tells us, Ep. E. l. 5, ch. 25, ed. Gr. Steph., that when pope
 Victor attempted to cut off the Asian bishops from his com-
 munion, for their difference in the observation of Easter, this
 deed of his was displeasing to several even of those bishops
 who were otherwise agreed with him as to this controversy,
 and says—‘The voices even of these were heard still more
 violently reproving Victor.’ Then he subjoins that famous frag-
 ment of St. Irenæus’ epistle to him on that occasion, in which
 he represents to him how differently he acted herein from his
 ancestors, and from the practice of the catholic church, who,
 notwithstanding of these differences, ‘all cultivated peace;
 and we also cultivate peace with each other,’ although, as
 he says afterwards, ‘it was more invidious to guard those
 who sought not to be guarded.’ From whence it appears
 how their imposing at this rate upon their brethren would
 have been judged of by the catholic church, even in this
 early age.

“THEN THEY condescend on two of these usages, which,
 they say, they have refused to allow their brethren to practise
 in the public worship, viz. ‘the mixing of water with the
 wine in the celebration of the holy eucharist, and praying for
 the dead,’ adding, ‘and some others,’ which they might like-
 wise have spoken out, since we all know them to be the obla-
 tion of the eucharistical sacrifice to God the Father, and the
 invocation of Him to send down His Holy Spirit upon the
 same, thereby to make the elements become the body and
 blood of Christ. Now these usages, they know very well,
 their brethren do not believe to be of an *indifferent* nature, so
 as to be left to the determination of the church, but to be
necessary parts of this highest act of public christian worship,
 and of divine appointment, as being instituted by Christ him-
 self, or by his apostles, and by them delivered to the catholic
 church. And that in believing so, they have the unanimous

suffrage of the same catholic church from the very time of the apostles, which hath always taught and practised as so delivered to her, and therefore necessary to be followed by her.

“TO WHICH all that they oppose is the judgment of divines who compiled the English liturgy, or rather who mangled and corrupted it, for all these primitive usages in it when first compiled, only that the invocation precedeth the history of institution, whereas it should follow the consecration, and the prayer of intercession is put first, which should be last: but though this order be not so natural (yet there is no material defect in it), and who have thereby made the church inconsistent and irreconcilable with herself, as she declared the standard of her reformation to be the doctrine and practice of the primitive catholic church, and thought especially to be observed in the celebration of the sacraments, and yet so manifestly rejected these most precious primitive usages which herself had once received. without any reflection on their godliness or learning, diminution of their character as confessors or martyrs, interested persons must see of how little weight their authority is when put in the balance with that of the noble apostles and martyrs and glorious confessors of the whole catholic church in the first and purest ages; when the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were still continued, as well as afterwards down to the unhappy disorders of our otherwise necessary Reformation.

“BUT THEY SAY, ‘the unseasonable and unwarrantable viewing and pressing of these usages by an incompetent authority hath broken and divided our brethren in England cannot miss to have the same fatal effect, if they are in the same unwarrantable manner introduced among us.’ But unseasonableness, no time can be unseasonable for reviving of necessary duties, if we have been so unhappy as to neglect them. Prudence, indeed, ought to take place in directing to the most proper methods of doing it, but it can never be true christian prudence which teacheth us to continue in the neglect of them, far less to oppose and condemn them on other sides, it were easy to shew that this is so far from being an unseasonable time, that we can never expect a more seasonable, perhaps not so seasonable, a time, for this purpose as the present is, with respect to us. And I think their being a divine institution is a sufficient warrant for reviving it. And if we should grant that there is any incompetency of authority, yet at whose door does the blame of this lie

thers, who oppose their brethren by the majority of their numbers, and then cry out upon the incompetency of their authority? But I have already shewn that the authority of every single bishop is sufficient for this purpose within his own jurisdiction; especially where he hath not limited his power by his own deed, in binding himself to the observation of antecedent canons (which is none of our case). And that would have been looked upon as a tyrannical procedure in the first ages of the church for a majority of bishops, even though assembled in council, to have imposed upon a smaller number of their colleagues in matters of this nature, and that their censuring of, and dividing from them, on account of such different practices, would have been then reckoned schismatical. And in such a case as ours, where there are only bishops at large, who are not canonically elected to particular districts, and consequently can claim no authority over these districts to which they have never been so elected, I can see nothing to hinder such of the clergy as are persuaded of the necessity of these usages from practising them, and from putting themselves under the inspection of any catholic bishop who is of the same judgment with them, and applying to him for the performing of such episcopal acts to them as they shall stand in need of, while the districts to which they belong continue to be vacancies, which, as I have shewn, cannot be filled without the consent at least of the majority of the clergy and people of these districts.

“I MUST HERE likewise take notice, that they speak not only of reviving, but ‘pressing these usages,’ notwithstanding that they are conscious to themselves that (whatever the case might have been in England) there was no such thing ever intended here; and that all that their brethren required, was only that themselves, and such as are the same way persuaded as they are, might have the liberty of their own practice, without censure or imposition in either side. Yet they go on earnestly to exhort and obtest, in the bowels of Our Lord Jesus Christ, carefully to shun these fatal rocks whereon others have been shipwrecked before.’ Though it be evident that these divisions in England, which they here refer to, were occasioned only by their mutually imposing upon one another, and could not have happened if each of them had contented themselves with the liberty of their own practice, and kept a mutual good understanding and correspondence together as catholic brethren, notwithstanding of their differences according to the primitive practice: And therefore this earnest exhortation is proper for none but themselves, who are the only

imposers here; and if they will take it to themselves, as they ought to do, and so forbear their unwarrantable impositions, there will be no occasion to fear any such shipwreck among us.

“THEY ADD, ‘That for this purpose they think it meet to refresh the memories of the clergy with the promise they made at their ordination, to maintain quietness, peace, and love among all christian people.’ But they have more need to refresh their own memories with this promise, who are themselves the only disturbers of our peace and quiet, by their imposing on the consciences of their brethren.

“THEY SAY, indeed, that ‘the reviving of these primitive usages at this unseasonable time is not reconcileable with this promise.’ But how will they make this appear, while they are, at most, but *recommended*, and *not*, as they would unjustly insinuate, *pressed* upon any person? And as for the time, I am persuaded that all men of sense, who think they ought ever to be restored, will agree, if they rightly consider it, that no time can be more seasonable than the present. So that it is easy to see that this is but a mere pretence of such as are altogether enemies to these primitive catholic practices, and would as much oppose the restoring of them at any other time as they do now.

“THEY PUT THEM in mind, likewise, that they promised, in the ordinal by which they were ordained, ‘to give faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments as the Lord hath commanded, and as this church and realm have received the same.’ They ought to have added with the ordinal, ‘according to the commandment of God.’ But this church and realm, of which they are members, have prescribed no set form for the celebration of the sacraments, and therefore there is certainly nothing in this promise that can hinder them from using any form that is agreeable to the commandments of God. They seem to have foreseen this, and therefore, to prevent it, have put a very surprising interpretation upon the words of this promise, and such as I believe no clergyman ever dreamt of when he made it. That when they say this church and realm, they do not mean, as the words themselves naturally import, this church and realm to which they belong, and in which they are ordained, but another neighbouring church and realm, upon which they have no manner of dependence; and that for no other reason but because this church hath thought fit to make use of her ordinal in the ordination of her clergy. If they had, indeed, believed this to be the design of this promise, made by themselves at their own ordi-

how could they have satisfied their consciences in using so long to administrate both the sacraments after a temporary way, and in continuing still so to administrate them, viz. baptism, and not according to the prescribed of that church? But though this absurd interpretation allowed, yet this promise is justly to be limited by the ring words, which they omitted—‘according to the commands of God.’ So that if these usages be, as they have clearly proven to be, the commandments of God, delivered by Christ and his apostles to the church, they would be at liberty, or rather they would be bound by this promise (or as it is consistent with itself) to observe them. And as the censure with which they threaten them, it will be, as unnecessary, so most unjust; and their answer is very being no other than what the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul gave to the Jewish Sanhedrim (Acts, iv. 19). And it concerns themselves seriously to reflect in time, how they answer to God at the great and terrible day of judgment, thus discharging what he, either by Himself or His apostles, hath commanded to be used, and given us the same evidence for it of an universal, uninterrupted, practical tradition, from the beginning, attested by the written monuments of the church in every age downwards from that of the apostles, that we have for the Scriptures themselves (for the other enthusiastic proofs will never pass with men of sense, who impartially examine them), or for our common christianity.

THEY COME next to magnify their own condescension, for that it was so great as to induce them to indulge their zealous brethren in the use of the Scottish liturgy. A great licence indeed! To allow them the use of a liturgy that was composed for our own church, rather than that of a neighbouring one, when neither of them are enjoined by any ecclesiastical canons of this church! But they know very well that it is not this or the other particular liturgy which we are for, but these primitive usages themselves, which the church has received as a sacred depositum from Christ and his apostles, and delivered down to us as such: with respect to me of which both these liturgies are equally defective. It is, for bishops to pretend to indulge their colleagues, plainly imports a claim of superiority over them, especially when they reckon it a great condescension, and seems indeed to insinuate their retracting it, is very opposite to the equality and independency of bishops, which, as I have already proved, they enjoyed in the first and purest ages of the church, and which, consequently, they must still be en-

entitled to, where they have not some way limited this power by their own deed; and even where they have, it may be proved, that this power not being their own property, what they are entrusted with by God, for the benefit of church; as their giving up any part of it, unless on the prospect of a greater benefit to this church, must be a betrayal of their trust, and consequently invalid: so, though it be done on such a prospect, yet when this prospect fails, and the interests of that church which is committed to their trust requires their resuming of it (of which themselves only can judge), they are then bound to resume it, when the only thing which could oblige God to ratify their cession (not of their own power, but of His, with which he had entrusted them) and so make it valid, is no longer to be attained by it.

“THEY SAY, ‘that by this,’ their pretended indulgence ‘they hoped to prevent all further disturbance;’ when, at the same time, the whole nation must see that there neither was nor is yet, any disturbance but what they themselves caused by their unnecessary, unreasonable, and (according to the principles of the primitive church) tyrannical imposition. However,

“THEY ADD,—‘But seeing neither this (viz. the indulgence mentioned), nor their own express passing from absolute and indispensable necessity of these said usages, restrain them, &c.’ As to their indulgence, I have already considered it; but that any of their brethren who are for the usages, have any way acknowledged the no-necessity of them is more than I know of, or do as yet believe. They did, indeed, think, with St. Cyprian, that though they be necessary yet they had no power to impose them on their colleagues, to separate from them on that account. And I wish that those themselves, who had much better reason, had been of the same peaceable principles; then we should have heard nothing of any disturbances occasioned by the practice of these usages.

“OR THEY MIGHT, perhaps, out of their tender love and regard for peace and unity, have condescended even so far as to promise to communicate on some occasions with their colleagues, even without these usages, rather than be obliged to break with them; not that they believed, or intended here to declare, that they were not necessary, and of divine institution; or that they themselves could lawfully administer the sacrament without them, or constantly and of choice so communicate. But that they presumed that God, in this case would not impute the defects to them, but to the administrators, who put this unhappy necessity upon them, either to

so, or else they would no longer maintain catholic peace and unity with them as brethren and colleagues. And this promise they might be the more easily induced to make, that these occasions would but very rarely, if ever, occur, and that they hoped thereby to secure to themselves, and those who are of the same judgment with them, the undisturbed practice of these primitive usages; on which condition only, I presume, they have made it. Now this charitable presumption of theirs in favour of peace, if it hold at all, would have held as well, even according to their own opinion, though the defect had been in the want of the cup altogether, as in the lay communion of the popish churches; and therefore it is no proof of their having passed from the belief of the necessity of the mixture, or of any of these usages. However, it plainly shews their willingness to go to the utmost lengths they possibly could, with any consistency to their principles, in order to satisfy even the harsh and unreasonable demands of their brethren, and thereby, if it could have been done, to preserve peace with them.

“AND THEREFORE, since even so great a condescension will not satisfy them, nor any thing less than a total giving up of these primitive usages (which can never be lawfully complied with by those who, with so good reason, believe them to be necessary, and of divine institution); but that, instead of this, they abuse it by putting so perverse a construction upon it. It is very plain who must be the authors of whatever divisions or disturbances shall be thereby occasioned among us; for it is evident that the using, or even recommending, of these primitive practices, can never, as they pretend without any the least ground, tend to rend and destroy this afflicted church, if themselves would forbear their unnecessary and unjust censures of what they dare not condemn as unlawful (without at the same time condemning the whole catholic church of God from the beginning), and have never been able to answer the solid arguments by which they have been proved to be necessary parts of that highest act of public christian worship—the sacrifice of the eucharist. And now I think it is sufficiently clear, from what has been said, that this their remonstrance and injunction is far from being either necessary or loving.

“THEY CONCLUDE with the exhortation of the apostle,—‘Finally, &c.’ But how is this perfection reconcileable with the neglect of necessary christian duties? Or how can they exhort us to be of good comfort, while they are endeavouring to deprive us of one of the greatest comforts that christians

can enjoy in this life, even valid sacraments, by thus prohibiting them to be celebrated according to the institution of Christ, upon which their validity depends? And whether are we to be unanimous in firmly adhering to, or in rejecting of, divine institutions? Or must we give up the truth, that we may live in peace with them who have declared themselves enemies to peace on any easier terms? Or is this the way to entitle us to the blessing of Jesus, who hath declared himself to be the Truth, as well as the God of peace? It is, therefore, certainly the duty of clergy and laity, notwithstanding of this injunction, to examine this controversy with all the accuracy and impartiality which the importance of it requires; and if they find (as undoubtedly they will, if they thus examine it) that these are indeed necessary parts of the public worship of the christian church, enjoined by Christ and his apostles, and as such always taught and practised by the catholic church in all ages from the beginning, then to contend earnestly for them in their several stations, and heartily to remonstrate against all such attempts as this, to discourage and discharge the practice of them. And if, notwithstanding of such a remonstrance, they shall still continue in these rigorous measures, and break off all correspondence with, nay, and proceed to censures against their brethren and colleagues, and so violate the unity of the church, then they ought, unquestionably, to join with those bishops who adhere to these primitive usages of apostolical tradition, and who, at the same time, have shown all that favour for peace which is any way consistent with their duty to do, and not with such as condemn them, and unjustly censure their brethren for adhering to them; and this they ought to do without any regard to their numbers; for truth is not always on the side of the majority.

“As THEY have concluded their injunction with an exhortation of the apostle, so I shall conclude these remarks upon it with another, I hope as pertinently applied:—‘Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle.—*Finis*’.”

TO THE FORMULA Mr. Rattray gave the following judicious and spirited answer:—

“TO THIS LETTER is annexed a formula, or declaration, which is handed about among the clergy to be subscribed by them. This formula has a very odd introduction, especially considering that they design it should be subscribed by as

¹ Communicated by a friend, in the original MS.

many of the clergy throughout the kingdom as shall be so ignorant of their duty and privileges as to be led into the snare. The introduction is—

“‘THAT THE bishop of Edinburgh having convened his clergy, and laid before them the present danger of the church, &c.’ where to pass by Mr. F———n’s taking to himself the stile of bishop of Edinburgh, which would insinuate his claiming a title to the whole jurisdiction of the former bishops of Edinburgh, and to the privileges challenged by them; notwithstanding that he cannot but know that this was never designed him by his electors; nay, that it was particularly excepted against, and that he was only chosen to the *district* in and about Edinburgh, not to the whole diocese of Edinburgh. To let this pass, I say, what obligation can his convening of the clergy of the town of Edinburgh, and laying any thing before them, lay upon such presbyters as are none of his clergy, and therefore have no dependence upon him, to bind up themselves even from any indifferent practice, from which they are not restrained by any canons of this church, far less from the practice of such things as, if they impartially examine them (which they ought not to preclude themselves from the liberty of doing), they cannot but find to be necessary duties? But that which is still more surprising is, that this should be required even from such presbyters as are actually within the jurisdiction of another catholic bishop, to whom they have promised canonical obedience. And as to the specious pretence of danger to the peace and unity of the church, I have already fully considered it, and shewn how groundless it is. Then follows the promise and declaration itself; viz.

“‘THAT FOR preserving the peace and unity of the church (which to all good men ought to be very dear and precious), they shall not make any innovation in the doctrine and worship of this church as now received among us, by introducing and practising the said usages.’ Here the peace and unity of the church is again inculcated, as if they thought only by the frequent repetition of the same thing, without any further reason, to put out men’s eyes, and make them believe contrary to their senses. They make the clergy say, that this peace ought to be very dear and precious to all good men; which is undoubtedly true. But I wish themselves had seriously thought so; for then, certainly, they would have forborne their unjust as well as unnecessary impositions, which are the most effectual method the enemy of our peace could have suggested for embroiling and dividing us. Besides, the clergy cannot

but be sensible that even peace itself must be overrated, when it is purchased at the expense of truth, and of renouncing necessary duties enjoined by Christ and his apostles, and such received and practised by the catholic church in all ages.

“YET FOR NO other reason, but because themselves are resolved, if their own unreasonable and unlawful demands are not complied with, without any necessity to violate the peace and unity of the church, by breaking off all catholic correspondence with their brethren and colleagues, and, perhaps, by proceeding to those unjust censures which they have threatened even against them, as well as against such of the inferior clergy as have no dependence upon them, by not living within their jurisdiction (which will therefore, especially in this case, be no better than *Bruta fulmina*); they expect that the clergy should, contrary to their manifest duty, promise to practise these primitive and necessary usages, which they are pleased to call ‘innovations in the doctrine and worship of the church.’

“BUT IF the worship of this church was not very lately defective, why did themselves concur in the innovations which have been already made (if the restoring of primitive principles and practices must needs be branded with the odious name of innovations); and if it would have been very unreasonable for the clergy to have bound themselves by any such promise then, must it not be so now likewise, if it shall be found to be still defective in things of as great importance at least as those which were then thought of sufficient moment to require a reformation? And how shall this be known, but by having recourse to the doctrine and worship of the catholic church in the first and purest ages, which ought certainly (even by the confession of the church of England herself) to be the standard of all true reformation? Besides, I would gladly know what they mean by the *received* doctrines of this church. For my part I know of no doctrines she can be said to have received, except what are contained in the primitive creeds. And even as to worship, though the English Common Prayer Book hath come to be now generally used, yet it hath never been enjoined by any authoritative deed of the church herself. And therefore there are many of our more intelligent clergy, who, in celebrating the holy eucharist, have all along used the Scottish liturgy, as being, by much, preferable to the English. Others have turned the [first] post communion prayer into a prayer of oblation. And several, for aught I know, even before the Revolution (this is matter of fact), to be

are a great many years ago, particularly in the northern parts of the kingdom, have used the mixture; and, on the other hand, there are some, even in Edinburgh itself, who still continue their old extempore way; nay, the most part, if not all, of them there, ordinarily thus administer the sacrament of baptism.

“SINCE, THEREFORE, there is no set form of worship prescribed by this church, and that there have been hitherto, and still are, so many differences allowed among us, and that without any the least danger to our peace and unity, what can be the design of expressing so much zeal at this time only against these primitive usages? It looks as if they were prejudiced against them only because they are primitive: or else they must be made tools to serve the interest of a certain party of the English non-jurors, who have nothing to plead for their own stiffness against these usages but their obligation to observe the canons and rubrics of that church, which do not at all concern us; unless we suffer ourselves to be so far imposed upon as implicitly to receive all her constitutions without farther examination, as if they were therefore obligatory on us, and that we were not at freedom, according to our duty, to regulate the doctrine and worship of our own church, after the pattern of the first and purest ages of the primitive church, in any instance wherein the church of England hath, contrary to her own rule, departed from it, which (whether it be intended by them or not) is in effect to make us *subject* to her¹.”

TO HIS LETTER of the 7th of December, last year, Lockhart received an answer from the royal Exile, dated 5th of April, which contained the following sentence:—“Pray let the Scots bishops know how sensible I am of the message they sent me by you, and of the regard they shewed to me in adding to their number the two I desired might be so; and now we understand one another rightly on that head, I hope we shall be able to proceed in such matters for the future with mutual satisfaction².” The fearless intrepidity of bishop Gadderar, in governing his diocese with perfect independence of the laird of Carnwath, gave that gentleman much trouble, and he seems, with the assistance of his friend, bishop Irvine, to have instigated the primate to adopt rash measures to bring Gadderar under the dominion of the *regale*. To the horror of the presby-

¹ From the original manuscript; communicated by a friend, and never before published.

² Lockhart Papers, 98.

terians, he continued to advocate the usages in his diocese, and his clergy seconded his zeal with prompt obedience. Mr. Cheyne, in his admirable Vindication, cites part of a letter from his successor, in which he states, that “bishop Gadderar, on his coming to Aberdeen, caused some hundred copies of that office [the Scottish communion office of 1637], as it was first published, to be printed for the diocese [of Aberdeen], and although no manner of alteration was made in those copies, yet he still used it, as did his clergy by his advice and the apparent reasonableness of the thing, in that order of the parts in which the office complained of appears; all the clergy marking that order on the back of the title-page with a pen, for their own direction, as did several of the laity their own copies¹.” To this period may be traced the eucharistic office of the Scottish church in its present form, as a consequence of the general use of the English liturgy, as well as to bishop Gadderar as the man who had given the first impulse to that restoration of catholic truth and catholic rites which the Scottish church was privileged to adopt. Mr. Cheyne again says,—“In that year [1723], Dr. Gadderar was elected bishop of Aberdeen, which is as pregnant an indication of the sentiments of his electors upon the subject of the usages, as their choice of the Hon. Archibald Campbell, two years before. Dr. Gadderar was equally well known to be earnest for the revival of those primitive doctrines which the influence of a puritanical theology had altogether thrust out, or too much obscured; and the repeated concurrence of a whole diocese, at that time the most important and the most united in the church, in the election of two men so much distinguished for their attachment to the doctrine and practice of the primitive church, shews what had been going on quietly among the clergy in the remotest districts of the country. It seems quite an insufficient account of the progress of these doctrines, to say that it was owing to the disputes of the non-jurors. There was evidently a deeper cause for it. The loss of establishment had cast the church back upon her own intrinsic powers, and the necessity the clergy were under of defending their position on principles recognised by the catholic church for many ages, prepared their minds for the general appeal to primitive antiquity as the witness of catholic truth. Whether the first impulse came from the English non-jurors or not, the Scottish clergy were prepared to move in the direction of *restoration*. It was scarcely possible but that the study of antiquity, which had

¹ Authority and Rise, &c. 26.

produced the “Cyprianic Age,” should lead to the recovery of other portions of primitive doctrine and practice, besides what was available in the episcopal controversy. Bishop Gadderar thus found his clergy ready to go along with him in his work of restoration¹.”

THERE SEEMS to have been a very great backwardness among the clergy, if not a refusal, to sign the formula that had been sent to them. It was therefore found necessary to address a letter to Mr. Norrie, at Dundee, requiring him to procure the subscriptions of the clergy in the diocese of Brechin. It is as follows:—“Reverend brother,—Forasmuch as we are informed that there is a delay put to the subscribing of the *formula* by the presbyters of Dundee and Meigle, upon the prospect of an accommodation of which we know nothing, wherefore we desire you may be pleased to call them again together, and let them know that we wonder they who were inclined to subscribe should have delayed it, when we were so very positive in our first orders. And now we earnestly desire that, without further delay, ye subscribe the preceding *formula*; and that ye will give us an account of the recusants. (Signed) John, bishop of Edinburgh; Arthur Millar, bishop; William Irvine, bishop; Andrew Cant, bishop; David Freebairn, bishop².”

LOCKHART’S wrath against the bishop of Aberdeen became so vehement, that he made a regular report of what he considered his disloyalty and disobedience to the royal exile; to whom he wrote on the 21st of May:—“Since my last, Gadderar has gone to the north, and boldly contemned both the advices and orders of the college and your trustees, by openly advancing his opinions and practising his usages; and having gained several of both clergy and laity over to his way of thinking, is in a fair way of creating a terrible schism, which cannot fail in having dismal effects, by dividing those that have hitherto lived cordially, and been ready to join hand in hand for the service of the church and state. The college bishops are inclined to delay, as long as possible, their proceedings to *suspend* Gadderar and such of the clergy as follow him, because they would gladly shun propaling this unhappy division to the world, having at the same time too much reason to apprehend their authority, as matters stand, will not meet with the regard that is due to it. A good number of your trustees thought it incumbent on them to lay this matter before you, and withal directed me to offer their hum-

¹ Cheyne’s Authority and Rise, 27, 28. ² Sievwright’s Principles, p. 167.

ble opinion that a letter from you to the college (or to the bishop of Edinburgh, to be communicated to them), approving of their opposition to all novelties at this juncture, and recommending to each of them singly, and to all inferior clergy, to shew a regard and give due obedience to the authority and direction of the college, and to continue their utmost endeavours, by the most prudent methods, to discourage and crush all practices tending to the contrary, as being pernicious to the interests of the church and your service ¹."

WITH LOCKHART at the one ear, and bishop Irvine at the other, the primate seems to have been pushed on to interfere with bishop Gadderar in the administration of his diocese but which the bishop of Aberdeen disregarded. The former says, "The college, finding Gadderar still persisting in acting contrary to *their orders*, resolved to cite him to appear before them, to answer for presuming to introduce any innovations on the worship and ceremonies of the church, without, nay, contrary to, their repeated orders, and to give an account on what ground and by what title he pretended to exercise the jurisdiction of a bishop in the diocese of Aberdeen. And as they *knew he would not* give obedience to their citation, they resolved to suspend him. And this step they thought necessary, because the enemies of the church represented that the episcopal clergy were already making advances to Rome (... and what might be expected if their popish king were on the throne? and as surmises tended highly to the prejudice of both church and king, the bishops thought it incumbent on them to manifest their dislike of what gave their enemies such a handle against them²." This stretch of metropolitical power was evidently done at the instigation of Lockhart, who dreaded nothing more than the resumption of diocesan superintendence, where every bishop, being sovereign of his own diocese would not suffer him to meddle in their affairs. It is a singular fact, that whenever attempts are made to restore any catholic rites, that, from the lukewarmness of portions of the church, have become as it were obsolete, the cry of popery is immediately sent forth by those who feel rebuked by the zeal of others for catholic truth, which never becomes obsolete. The presbyterians were now joining in the cry of popery; for Wodrow writes to a friend,—"I hear from the north that bishop Gadderar has been a second time there, propagating *his high-flying popish notions* of real presence, middle state, &c. from bishop Campbell's book, of the propagating of

¹ Papers, 99, 100.

² Ibid. 100, 101.

which you heard at the Assembly; that he has diaconate and presbyterate [*i. e.* I suppose, he has ordained deacons and priests] great numbers in this second visit; and there is no little breach among that party on this score. And bishop Fullarton sent a monitory letter to the episcopal clergy in Aberdeen, Moray, &c. discharging them to countenance Gadderar, to hold communion with him. This he was the rather inclined to do, that some people of distinction at Edinburgh undertook to prove that Gadderar is in pay and concert with the papists abroad; that after he has paved the way by these doctrines above, he is to return and preach some things yet rarer popery, though these are pretty near it¹."

As THE SCOTTISH episcopal clergy were the only body on which the unhappy Exile could exercise even the shadow of power, he and his trustees seemed to cling to that phantom with the greatest tenacity. The bishop of Aberdeen made them sensible that this sort of regal supremacy that was attempted to be continued upon the church was not to be endured by a free church relieved from her state shackles; hence the wrath of the prime minister. And in a letter to James, dated May 21st, he thought it "expedient to shew Gadderar a little more plainly in his proper colours, by exposing the title on which he claimed to act as bishop of Aberdeen. Some two or three years ago, the presbyters in that diocese applied to the college that they would appoint a bishop to preside over them and reside with them. The bishops, fearing they would choose Dr. Garden, who, having publicly advanced Madame Bourignon's wild doctrines, was by no means fit to be promoted, answered, that there was no need of consecrating a new bishop for that end, but if they, the presbyters, could name any of the college that was agreeable to them, he would be appointed to reside with them, if they, the bishops, approved of him. The presbyters accordingly met, and, to the surprise of every body, elected Mr. Archibald Campbell. The college, upon notice hereof, wrote to Campbell, signifying their being willing to approve of what was done, provided he would promise, under his hand, to maintain and propagate no new doctrine or usage not preached and warranted by the laws of this church. To this Campbell wrote a most pertinent answer, positively *refusing* to give that satisfaction, and styling bishop Fullarton as pope, and Millar and Irvine cardinals of the church of Scotland. This letter confirmed the college in their resolution not to approve of Campbell re-

¹ Correspondence, iii. 70, 71.

pairing to Aberdeen, and thereof acquainted the presbyters. However, Campbell, slighting the authority of the college, reckoned himself canonically elected by the presbyters; and though he came not from London to reside among them personally, he sent Gadderar with a commission to act as his vicar¹."

LOCKHART contends that this delegation of bishop Campbell was all the title by which bishop Gadderar held the diocese of Aberdeen; but he is mistaken; for this vicarious episcopacy was objected to by the primate, and therefore the clergy of that diocese proceeded to a new election, and chose bishop Gadderar to be their diocesan. He also ascribes the worst motives to this bishop, but particularly for having manifested "a base contempt of the authority of the *college* of bishops, and of the king's friends." He therefore insinuates that the bishop had it in contemplation to introduce some enormous heresy. The cause of diocesan episcopacy suffered a heavy loss in the death of bishop Falconar, on the 6th of July², this year. He was always opposed to the uncatholic system of collegiate episcopacy, which had been adopted from secular motives of temporal ambition, and from having been buoyed up by Lockhart, and the other trustees, with the fallacious hope of the restoration of the exiled family. In an expostulatory letter to bishop Irvine, bishop Campbell, after expressing his sorrow at the death of so good a man, took the opportunity of administering the following brief caution to him and the rest of his brethren:—"I hope this stroke will make those that remain strive to cultivate *peace* more industriously than ever, rather than take occasion, from the death of so good a man, to be more severe upon tender consciences³."

WODROW writes to a friend in Ireland, under date the 19th of August, that "the main thing before us [at a meeting of the commission] was a *terrible increase* of episcopal meeting-houses in the north; ten or twelve set up since last May. These rendezvouses of disaffection concern the civil government so much that we judged it proper to address the lords justices [the regents] on this occasion. What redress we shall have, I know not⁴." This fact shews that the presbyterians were beginning to succeed in emptying the parish churches of their episcopal incumbents, and, in consequence, that chapels were being erected by the ejected clergy.

THE DEATH of bishop Falconar removed an obstacle to

¹ Papers, ii. 100, 101.

² Ibid. 104.

³ Skinner, ii. 632.

⁴ Correspondence, iii. 81.

Lockhart's college scheme, and he accordingly congratulated his master on the opportunity which it afforded of carrying out their Erastian plans. In a letter dated September 10th, he writes, "For though bishop Falconar pretended submission to the college, yet secretly he favoured and promoted the seeds of division; and there was too much reason to apprehend that he and Gadderar designed very soon, without asking yours or the other bishops' approbation, to have consecrated several other bishops, with a view of strengthening and increasing their party, having, in order thereunto, drawn up a paper which was privately dispersed, wherein they remonstrated against the declaration which the college required, of all in holy orders promising to give obedience to their present superiors, and not to propagate any innovations; and in this paper were advanced several odd maxims, particularly that the present bishops of Scotland were all bishops at large, and owned no subjection to any other, or even to these, all acting in a collegiate body, so that each was at liberty to exercise his spiritual jurisdiction when and after what manner he pleased, without being controlable by or accountable to any other person. As Falconar was much respected, or rather revered, on account of his learning and piety, his opinion in these matters moved many to have a favourable opinion of them; but now that he is dead, we hope there will be less difficulty to keep them within due bounds. If Campbell come down, I believe the college will quickly suspend him, having sufficient grounds to warrant such a step, besides his promoting this schism. As his character is no ways suited to the station he was advanced to in the church, since Falconar's death, the college think it expedient to make a further promotion of bishops to be settled in those counties, such as Fife, Angus, and the Mearns [Forfarshire and Kinkardineshire, the district over which the late bishop Falconar presided], and in such other places as Aberdeenshire, where Gadderar applies himself to propagate his schism; at least, seeing most of the present bishops are men of a great age, they think it very necessary to have your allowance and direction to consecrate, at such times as they shall see cause and think it expedient, a certain number of other persons. This they desired me to lay before you, and withal presume to recommend Mr. Norrie, minister at Dundee; Mr. Duncan, minister at Kilbirnie; Mr. Ross, minister at Cupar; and Mr. Gordon, minister at Elgin; as persons in all respects qualified for the trust, hoping you will be pleased to authorise the consecration of all or such of them as they think convenient, and at such times as they

judge proper. Some few days after I received this instruction, I was again called upon by two of the bishops, who told me that the college appointed them to acquaint me, that on further consideration of the state of affairs, and fresh account of Gadderar's practices, they had resolved to cite him to appear before them, and answer for his presuming to assume the charge and exercise the office of bishop of the diocese of Aberdeen, *without you* or the college having approved or authorised the same, and to introduce any alteration in the worship and ceremonies of the church not authorised by the canons, without, nay, contrary to, the express orders of the college; and as they expected he would *not* appear, they in that case, *would suspend him*. At the same time, they foresaw insuperable difficulties and inconveniences that would attend the delay of one clothed with authority to counteract Gadderar and inspect the affairs of the church in the northern countries, until an answer to what is above represented could come from you, and that none of the present bishops could undertake it, being either very infirm or altogether unacquainted with the tempers and characters of the people, both clergy and laity, in those places; that therefore they thought it absolutely necessary to lose no time in consecrating a person and sending him to reside in these places; but as they had most profound respect for you, and a just regard for your authority, they would make no steps therein that might be displeasing to you, which they hope might be prevented if they represented the case to your trustees, and obtained their allowance to proceed immediately, in regard the present situation of affairs could not admit of so long a delay as to know your pleasure; and this they desired me to lay before your trustees, and report their opinion and directions in the matter I met, accordingly, with a good number of them, who, from conviction of the necessity of speedily performing what the college proposed, and in regard that they had shewn all due deference to your authority, did take upon them to approve the design, and directed me to acquaint the college thereof, and that I should likewise give you an account of what they had done, being hopeful you will not disapprove of it, seeing it was really a case of necessity, and the application made to your trustees preserves your prerogative unviolated. It will I believe, be expedient that you write two letters to the college, one authorising them to make the promotions in the manner desired, the other approving of what they had done with respect to Norrie; therein taking notice of the application made to your trustees, and of his consecration being

hastened without waiting for your previous direction, because of the inconveniences attending a delay, and that therefore you approved of what was done, and of his *taking upon him the government of the church in the diocese of Aberdeen*, and such other places as the college think fit to appoint. This authority from you will raise his credit, and make him more regarded in those countries where every thing that comes from you hath its due weight. I took a proper occasion also to acquaint bishop Fullarton that though I did not question his own and his brethren's regard for the royal authority, yet the step they were to make with respect to Norrie, might perhaps be adduced, many years after this, as a precedent against it, seeing nothing would appear to shew the method that was taken, and the true cause of it; for which reason I proposed that the college should write a letter to me, disclaiming any design of encroaching upon your prerogative, and shewing the reason of their proceeding so hastily in that matter. He desired me to draw up such a letter; which having done, he laid it before his brethren, and returned it to me signed, with some few additions of their zeal and loyalty to you. This letter I shall keep for your service, lest at any time coming, men of unruly tempers make a bad use of what was truly done with no bad views, and merely from necessity¹."

THIS LONG letter, which, in justice to all parties, I thought better to give entire, shews the state of slavery which their blind adherence to the royal supremacy inflicted and continued on the church. The promotion of Mr. Norrie was evidently a scheme of Lockhart's to break down the diocesan superintendence, which, in spite of his vigilance, had crept in, and was likely to spread; and to keep up that college system which was both uncatholic and impracticable. The primate was no match for the laird of Carnwath in cunning and worldly policy, or he would never have been ensnared into signing the following letter, alluded to in the close of the above despatch. It excites a smile to see the vast care for the prerogative of a prince who had not the slightest power to have either forwarded or retarded the promotions in the church, but by the unfortunate subserviency of the college bishops, who were alternately bullied and cajoled by Lockhart. The bishop's letter is dated, "Edinburgh, August 14th, 1723. Sir, the representation which the college of bishops made to the king's trustees, as it convinced them of

¹ Lockhart Papers, 103—107.

the necessity to lose no time in consecrating speedily some proper person to repair to the north, to oppose and counteract bishop Gadderar's unaccountable proceedings there, it will likewise stand as a clear evidence of our profound respect for his majesty's royal prerogative; for though we were well assured of many irreparable disadvantages attending a direct application to the king, and having his pleasure therein transmitted to us, yet we unanimously resolved to advance no steps therein, unless, upon a representation of the matter, we obtained the trustees' consent and approbation in regard to the present case of indispensable necessity. This, we hope, will so much convince his majesty that we are far from having any views of lessening the royal authority, that he will be graciously pleased to approve of what we have done with respect to the consecration of Mr. Norrie, who is a person well affected to his majesty's person and government; and as you are fully apprised of what steps we made in this affair, we beg and expect you will transmit to his majesty a just and full account thereof, with an assurance of our hearty zeal for his service, and our unalterable resolution to behave and demean ourselves with that dutiful regard towards him which is suitable to the principles and doctrine of the loyal and orthodox church of Scotland, and which we have hitherto maintained in the worst of times. This, by the direction and in the name of my colleagues, the other bishops of our church, is subscribed by me, who sincerely am, sir, *sic sub.* John, Bishop of Edinburgh¹."

BEFORE sending off his despatch of the 10th September, Lockhart added the following postscript, which accounts for the delay of the consecration of Mr. Norrie, and also intimates that bishop Gadderar had shewn some disposition to accommodate matters with the college:—"P.S. The day before I was to send this off, I received a letter from bishop Fullarton, acquainting me that Gadderar having made some shew of submission, the college did resolve to delay the consecration of Mr. Norrie until they knew your pleasure therein, and desired that, instead of Mr. Gordon, I should insert Mr. OCHTERLONIE, minister of Aberlemno, in the list of the persons they recommend. I have not time to transcribe this, and leave out what relates to Norrie being immediately consecrated; so I begged you would forgive this being writ by way of postscript, and what errors I may have committed in

¹ Lockhart Papers, 107, 108.

reducing this letter into cyphers, by being much straitened in time¹."

IN DUE TIME, a short admonitory letter was received from the royal Exile, "recommending, and indeed requiring," the bishops to lose no time, and to use every effort to promote the most prudent and effectual measures to establish an entire union and peace among themselves, and approving all that his cunning representative had done for preserving his prerogative². But bishop Gadderar still maintained his authority as ordinary of Aberdeen, and it would appear, from the editor's note to Wodrow's Correspondence, that Dr. Gadderar had remonstrated with the primate for the uncanonical interference of the college with his diocese. Chalmers, principal of king's college, Aberdeen, writes to Wodrow,—“Meantime, I have sent you the enclosed manuscript, which is a copy of the answers by Gadderar and his brethren in the north, returned to bishop Fullarton for his presuming to give directions to those not under his jurisdiction.” And this gentleman's brother writes to him from Aberdeen, dated December 11th, 1723:—“I thank you most heartily for the enclosed paper of Mr. Gadderar's. It is not worth your while to have my remarks on it; but, indeed, to me he appears pretty just in his reasonings from the principles he goes on, and I do not see how the bishop of Edinburgh, as sometimes he calls him, will easily evite them, unless he a little more openly declare the ancient usages to be modern popery, and come off a diocesan prelate's being the centre and principle of unity, and frankly own the old Scots prelacy, which I know was once *his* opinion, in opposition to the English usages and ceremonies. I wish you could procure me a copy of the circular letter, if there be any more in it than Mr. Gadderar takes notice of³.”

AT THIS TIME of rebuke and blasphemy, and after the accession of the house of Hanover, the church seems to have been crushed under the foot of the civil power in both ends of the island. George I. granted his license to the convocation on the 5th of May, 1715, to enter upon business; but by a letter to the archbishop, *he appointed* the subjects that they were to take under their consideration. And afterwards, the two houses having entered into keen debates respecting what has since been called the Bangorian Controversy, the convocation was pro-rogued with expressions of the royal displeasure; and, after

Lockhart Papers, 111, 112.

² Ibid. 113, 114.

³ Wodrow's Correspondence, note, iii. 96.

repeated prorogations, they were, on the 29th of March, 1723, prorogued for the last time, and have never since been suffered either to sit or to transact any business. In Scotland, the bishops and clergy appear to have voluntarily adopted a political slavery to a visionary authority most vexatiously and cunningly enforced by Lockhart, of Carnwath, and certain "Trustees." For political purposes he almost forced the bishops to adopt the uncatholic scheme of a college of bishops, out of whose number, at the wished-for Restoration, his master might appoint by *congé d'élire* to the legal bishopricks. The word bishop, however, is a relative signification, and implies a flock. The Scottish college is perhaps the only instance since the days of the apostles of any bishop having been consecrated without a special relation to a particular flock or diocese. The college bishops being *bishops at large*, without particular dioceses, had neither clergy nor laity who were properly their subjects. Bishops were appointed to succeed the apostles, to stand in Christ's stead, to exercise His kingly, priestly, and prophetic offices over their respective flocks; and therefore they are very justly esteemed spiritual princes, and their dioceses are their principalities or kingdoms. The episcopate is the summit of all the honours among men; and Ignatius says to the Ephesians, "you ought to regard the bishop Onesimus *as the Lord*." Those bishops, both in England and in Scotland, who were forcibly expelled from their principalities by merely lay power, were in much the same position as the exiled prince with regard to the state. In Scotland there was no schism in the church herself; for there were no intrusive bishops put into the places of the deprived prelates. A republican institution violently overturned the church, and usurped her place by a force entirely external to her. The church was driven into the wilderness, like the woman clothed with the sun, in the Apocalypse; and the instrument of the jesuits—the covenant—cast the stars of heaven to the earth. The case was different in England, where the bishops and clergy were also deprived on account of their declining to transfer their allegiance from their natural sovereign to a stranger. This, however, made no schism; and it was not till new bishops were consecrated and put into the dioceses from which the old prelates had been ousted, that the schism commenced. Then, and not till then, bishop was opposed to bishop, and altar was erected against altar.

THE UNION of church and state commenced with Adam in paradise, and continued through the patriarchs, who were both the high-priests and the kings of their own dominions; till

ok a particular family and constituted them his priests, whom the high-priest was His viceroy. After kings appointed over his peculiar people, the church continued incorporated with the state, till it was entirely swept by the Romans. From the days of our Lord till the of Constantine, the church of Christ was thrown upon resources; and it made its way through much tribulation that particular period of its existence is the time of its purity, and forms the example for subsequent ages. Constantine embraced the christian faith, he became the nursing-father, and established it in all his dominions, the state christian; but he did not exert a supremacy such as we now understand by that word. The Donatist occasioned the regal supremacy over the church by going to Constantine as to an ecclesiastical judge, in the election of Cecilianus, bishop of Carthage; yet all he could do in the case was to support the bishops' judgment.

Donatus. This was a just interposition of the civil to support the ecclesiastical; but it became a precedent for encroachments by the civil, and of improper compliance and the shameful yielding by the ecclesiastical powers, of the rights and liberties of the church. Kings and popes subsequently exerted such a supremacy as almost annihilated the church's independence, particularly in Scotland, where, in papal times, it made a matter of merchandise and traffic, as has been related. James VI. made a mighty reformation, and reduced the supremacy on the right footing; for, upon the death of the bishop, the archbishop of St. Andrews assembled his provincial brethren, and they presented three names to the king, who selected one of them to fill the vacant see. Charles I. restored the supremacy in all its plenitude, and that was one of the causes that helped on his downfall; for having discovered the evil consequences of this step, he attempted to free the church from the encroachments of the secular and erastian laws. This gave the first spring to the rebellion, and to his own murder; and he is justly enrolled among the noble army of martyrs. The extirpation of the church, root and branch, was the natural and inevitable consequence of the supremacy of the jesuits, and of their introduction, the covenant. Charles II. exalted the supremacy by the Test and Retraction Act to such a pitch as annihilated the church's independence, and, as the presbyterians justly enough said, to put the king in the place of Christ. Then he imposed the Test on the church, and thus, although he did not intend it, he paved the way for the removal of our Candlestick, and for all

the persecution that followed. James VII., with the assistance of the Assertory and the Test Acts, and the advice of jesuits, carried out the supremacy to its utmost extent. The punishment for thus enslaving and oppressing the church has been the utter extinction of their families, and the reversion of the crown by another line to the descendants of James VI., who was a real nursing-father and protector of the church.

IT MAY EXCITE a smile to observe the anxious grasping at the power of the regal supremacy over the catholic church of Scotland, exhibited by the exiled prince, and pursued with so much perseverance and acrimony by his agent, Lockhart. But it must cause a sigh to witness the unfaithful subserviency of our blessed fathers in Christ, from mistaken political prejudices, throwing themselves as willing captives under a supremacy from which their very enemies had set them free. The only portion of power which the royal exile possessed was in the conscientious obedience, for there was no real force upon them, that the bishops and clergy yielded to his unreasonable interference in their own proper province. Bishop Gadderar alone, and bishop Falconar whilst he lived, seemed to act upon the principle of the independence of the church on the state; but it was not until some time after the extinction of the wretched college scheme, that the bishops and clergy entertained juster notions of the church's authority, and of the freedom that had been conferred upon her, by the presbyterian usurpation of her establishment. This small, oppressed, and persecuted church, however, has been selected by her Immortal Head to be an example to the church catholic of her original independence of all kings and states, whether christian in Europe, Mahometan in Asia, or only calling themselves christian in America. The prosperous and increasing church in North America has followed the example of Scotland; and in His good time God may perhaps influence the hearts of christian sovereigns, but especially of our own Queen, to set the church in their dominions free from the unchristian tyranny of the regal power, and then they will in reality become nursing-fathers and their queens nursing-mothers to the church. Then will the princes of the earth, instead of being her imperious, and sometimes sacrilegious, masters, "bow down to the church with their faces towards the earth." Their thrones would then be established in righteousness, were they to suffer every bishop to exercise his undoubted privilege of governing his own diocese, within the bounds of his divine commission, beneficially for the catholic church. And especially may it please God, who keepeth the hearts of sovereign princes in His own

nds, to give Victoria, our queen and governor, grace to suffer : elections of bishops in England to be a *reality*, and not, as present, *a mockery*: either for her majesty to present three n of renown to the dean and chapter of the dioceses for m to choose one of them for their bishop, or to suffer the an and chapter to choose and present three clergymen for the own to choose one of them for the vacant mitre. This sys- n, which was always acted on by James I., would secure the st bishops, and would not in any way compromise the long- ablished rights of the crown. May the Lord hasten the time en His kingdom on earth shall be as it is in heaven! May remember His church which He purchased with His blood d redeemed of old! May He send the Spirit of love and christian courage into the hearts of her governors, fear- ssly to do the work of God, FOR PERFECT LOVE CASTETH T FEAR!

CHAPTER LXIV.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RIGHT REV. JOHN FULLARTON
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH, VICAR-GENERAL, AND METROPOLITAN

1723.—Letter from James. — 1724. — General Assembly — Plot for making it permanent.—James's letter to the bishops.—A synod—Lockhart's interference.—A CONCORDATE—Lockhart's opinion—his intrigues to recommend bishop Irvine.—Election of new bishops.—A meeting of the Bishops.—Disputes about the supremacy.—Mr. Norrie elected and Duncan consecrated.—Lockhart's letter to James.—Proposed union of the Greek church not favourably received.—Another proposal to the church—their answer—brief account of the Greek church.—1725.—Death of the Czar Peter.—Prince's letter to the bishops—his letter to the king.—Malt tax.—A riot at Glasgow.—Death of bishop Irvine.—Consecration of Mr. Doughty.—A General Assembly, and fast.—1726.—Lockhart's recommendation of a successor to bishop Fullarton—recommends Mr. Gibson consecrated.—Prince's letter respecting consecrations and the primacy.—Fullarton's retirement.—Letters from the prince.—Lockhart's account of the consecrations of Ochterlonie and Rose.—Mr. Keith's opposition to Lockhart's conclusion of his letter—the consecration—remonstrance against it.—General Assembly.—Complaints against the catholic church.—Bishop's dog.—Death of bishops Fullarton and Norrie.—Remarks.—Lockhart's return to abscond.—Increase of meeting-houses.—Apostolic succession.

1723.—AMONGST his multifarious political intrigue Lockhart's attention was much occupied in directing the government of the church in what was purely their own business. He received an answer to his letter of the 21st of May, which complained was not sufficiently explicit, nay, that the king actually leaned to the diocesan side, and to those that advocated the Usages. "Whether," says Lockhart, "this mode of writing proceeded from no design, or that the king inclined expressly to condemn tenets and usages near those of his own church (on which account I pushed in my letters to make mention of the particulars) cannot pretend to determine¹." James laments the d

¹ Papers, ii. 112, 113.

that had occurred, and recommends peace and unity, and that they would in an amicable and friendly way put an end to all past differences.

1724.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met on the 14th of May; the earl of Findlater and Seafield was appointed commissioner. Their public acts are all connected with their own discipline, and are no way interesting¹; but Wodrow informs his wife that the committee for instructions met, and went through what relates to popery, and *disaffected meeting-houses*, both which were referred much to the commission. There are some hopes of getting a new law made, that may make probation against papists easier, and a fund to prosecute papists on. There are prayer books printed with the Pretender's name in them. Bishop Gadderar declares the church of England schismatics, and all that support not their suffering prince the Pretender, to a state of damnation²."

THE UNLUCKY supremacy, at which the presbyterians were obliged to wink hard, was an inconvenient barrier to that ambition for ascendancy which has ever been a conspicuous feature of their sect. But that they might reach the summit, they fell upon a new scheme to render their assembly *permanent*, and at the same time to relieve themselves from the presence of a royal commissioner. It was, to have the members of the commission *elected* and sent up by the presbyteries in the same manner as the members of the Assembly. This, they said, would prevent a certain club from being always the members of commission, and would assert the equality of representation *'and retrieve the sinking interests of the commission.'* It is probable this plot would have been carried into execution, had not Mr. Dundas, of Arniston, then the lord advocate, put a stop to it by declaring this would be *an assembly* under another name; that it would be a *new* judicatory; "that we have the *connivance* of the king for our commissions; but if their constitution was altered and brought to this channel, we were not to expect his connivance. "This is one of the boldest attacks on our constitution for these many years, and I wish the Assembly may extricate themselves well out of it³." In a subsequent letter, the uxorious old man informs us, that towards the end of queen Anne's reign it had been the intention of her government to prevent the meetings of the commission, and disclaim the legality of its acts; "our enemies," he says, knowing that by taking away the commission, our assemblies that cannot [*dare not*, owing to the royal supremacy],

sit long, could be of very little use to us !¹” This is a strange confession ! They have always maintained that the General Assembly was the keystone of their *divine* institution. But here we have an Assembly asserting that what *they say* God’s own appointment is of *very little use*, unless it be supported by an illegal court that is *only connived at* by the civil government, and that, too, of *man’s* institution during the great rebellion ! O the inconsistency and the irreverence of presbytery !

THE PRINCE sent an answer to Mr. Lockhart’s letter of the 10th September, inclosing the following letter to the bishop dated March 18, 1724 :—“ Mr. Lockhart did not fail to inform me, in due time, of the particulars you were desirous I should be apprised of in relation to the church of Scotland, and was equally affected with concern for the want of union and harmony amongst you and your brethren, and with the deeper sense of gratitude and regard for the constant loyalty, submission, and attachment, which you have expressed for me on this and so many other occasions. My particular esteem for your body is well known to you, and your present behaviour towards me doth justly increase it, and with it my concern for your welfare, and all that may contribute to your advantage and to preserve among you peace and union, which I most earnestly recommend unto you as equally important both to yourselves and the good cause ; and therefore, to give you new proof of my sentiments towards you, and of my confidence in you, I hereby approve and authorize your adding your number the four persons you propose to me for that effect ; viz. Mr. John Ochterlonie, Mr. Robert Norrie, Mr. Alexander Duncan, and Mr. James Ross, not doubting that their principles of loyalty and affection to their country and my family are suitable to those other qualifications which has made you think them worthy to be the rulers of a church, the members of which have, on so many occasions, shewed themselves to be equally good patriots and good subjects. But I am most tender of any thing that might in the least disturb your peace, or give our adversaries any handle to exercise their cruelty towards you, and considering my present distance from you, I leave to your determination to delay the adding your number the four above-named persons as long as you shall think fit, to the end, that by taking a proper time to make that step, it may be void of all inconvenience, and only tend to your advantage, as I intend and wish it may prove. The present circumstances, and my just regard for your safety

¹ Correspondence, iii. p. 136.

would not allow of my writing to you in another form, but it is my intention that you should look on what is herein contained as authentic, and as sufficient to justify with me your proceeding in consequence of it. And you may be always assured of my readiness and desire to favour and protect the church of Scotland, and to shew you the personal esteem and value I have for yourselves ¹."

THE ROYAL EXHORTATIONS, so often repeated, to peace and unity, produced the desired effect, and "the bishops resolved to meet in a synodical manner, and accordingly invited bishop Gadderar from Aberdeen, to meet them at Edinburgh, in June, 1724²." The primate wrote to the bishop of Aberdeen, in the name of his brethren, the College of Bishops, and invited him to "a close, free, and amicable conference, for bringing things to that happy crisis, as we may harmoniously concur together in advancing what doth most tend to the interest of true religion." Bishop Gadderar complied with this invitation, partly in obedience to the interference of the prince, and partly with the desire of accommodating the differences that had arisen in the church. The author of the Memoirs says—this general meeting was held in June, but Mr. Skinner says it took place on the 9th of July, at Edinburgh. Some of the trustees were present at this meeting, and exerted the authority of the exiled prince to bring the meeting to harmony. The bishops, says Lockhart, "have acted very prudently, for as they were resolved to maintain their authority, they at the same time shewed a readiness to adjust differences upon reasonable terms, which, with your letters, *forced* Gadderar to submit, though at the same time he and his brethren would never have adjusted matters, had not some of your trustees been present at their meetings, and by virtue of *your authority* interposed betwixt them³." There had been several meetings held, and the debates were long and acrimonious; but at last, "after much communing and reasoning about the usages, the following stipulations," or concordate, was agreed to⁴:—"They all met, and after several several serious conferences, they subscribed, on the *fourth* of July, a paper called the Concordate, by which it was generally thought peace and solidity would be established; but, alas! the seeds of discord were only under the embers, and soon after broke forth into a flame⁵."

"BISHOP JAMES GADDERAR, for his part, whatever may be his

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 116, 117.

² MS. Memoirs, p. 14.

Lockhart Papers, ii. 118.

⁴ Skinner, ii. 633.

⁵ MS. Memoirs, 14.

sentiments concerning the mixture, yet being most desirous to have the bond of peace and cement of unity with his brethren firmly established, makes the following concession and declaration:—That he is willing, whenever any occasion offers of communicating with his brethren, to receive the unmixed cup at their hands: That he will not, in his ministrations in any congregation, mix publicly; and will use his best endeavours that all under his inspection shall walk by the same rule: And forasmuch as the primus and the other bishops have permitted the use of the Scotch liturgy to such of the clergy as shall think fit to use it, therefore the said bishop Gadderar declares and promises that he will not insist upon introducing any of the other ancient usages, which have not been authorised and generally received in this church; and that to prevent division, he will discharge the introducing them within his district, unless the primus and the rest of his brethren, in a lawful convocation, shall see sufficient reason to order matters otherwise: On the other hand, the primus and the other bishops do grant their authority and commission to bishop Gadderar to officiate as bishop of the district of Aberdeen for the future; with this express condition, that he do not ascribe his officiating there to any delegation or substitution from any person whatsoever, but allenarly to the election of the presbyters, and authority of the bishops of this church.—(Signed), John Edinburgh and *Primus*; James Aberdeen; Arthur Millar, bishop; William Irvine, bishop; Andrew Cant, bishop; David Freebairn, bishop¹.”

IN THIS CONCORDATE Lockhart says that bishop Gadderar “did submit himself to the power of the College in all matters, from whom alone he did acknowledge that he derived his authority to exercise the episcopal functions and powers in his diocese. So that here he gave up his friend and patron, Mr. Campbell, who was not a little nettled at it, and pretended still to have the only legal title to be bishop of Aberdeen. I cannot express the disorder that was at this meeting, for there was little reasoning on the matter; most of the discourses being invectives and unmannerly reflections against Gadderar, who being, on the other hand, as obstinate as a mule, nothing to purpose would have attended this conference, had not the noblemen abovementioned interposed, and by their solid reason and authority adjusted matters in the manner I have briefly related².”

LOCKHART magnifies his own tact in bringing this meeting to an harmonious conclusion; and he adds,—“And I cannot

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 633.

² Lockhart Papers, ii. 124.

but reckon it a piece of service done you, in regard the common enemy seemed mightily pleased at the prospect of a division amongst those who were reckoned to have an attachment to you, and propagated a world of false stories, with an intent to blow the coal and weaken the interest of the common cause. But now I hope they are disappointed on this head. Whilst I am on this subject, I cannot but observe and regret how unaccountable it is for men that are at, under, and in a state of persecution, to be so factious and divided among themselves; and yet this hath been, and I believe will be the case till the end of the world, especially amongst clergymen, whom it is not easy, under any circumstances, to keep within due bounds¹." Politicians generally act upon principles of expediency and selfishness; and having no solid foundation for their actions, will do just as it appears at the time to be the most expedient. Clergymen, however, act from a higher and more holy principle; and therefore the advocates of both sides of an opinion are tenacious of what each thinks is the truth; hence, whether they are in a persecuted or in a prosperous state, they "contend earnestly" for that which they believe to be the truth; but which politicians call faction and division.

THE PRIMATE was now well stricken in years, and there was a probability that he would not live much longer. Lockhart, therefore, was on the alert to procure the elevation of his friend bishop Irvine, who was the royal exile's most devoted adherent, to that dignity at his death. He therefore took care to prepare the prince for coming events. "Amongst the small number of our Scots bishops," he writes, "there is abundance of private views and self-interest, which, in a great measure, is kept lurking, by the prudence and authority of their *primus*, Mr. Fullarton; but on the event of his death (which, as he is of a great age, and not very healthy, may happen too soon), it is easy to foresee it will break out, and have very bad consequences, particularly on the occasion of acting as *primus* during the interval of acquainting you of his death, and receiving your commands as to the person you design to succeed him. He is a person of good sense and experience in business, and by his joining my lord Dundee and lord Kenmure, on which first account he was obliged to retire for several years to France, and lay long in prison after the unhappy action at Preston, his loyalty and zeal for your service is unexceptionable. The viscount of Kilsyth, and most of those now with you, knew him well, and will confirm what I

say of him. Though this person is certainly the fittest to succeed Mr. Fullarton, it would not be proper that you should nominate him, or any other, till the event happen. But it is the humble opinion of several of your trustees, that it would tend much for preserving that peace and unity which you so much, and on such good grounds, do recommend, if you would send a letter directed to the bishops, signifying that whereas you are at a great distance and being sensible that many inconveniences may arise to the church of Scotland, if Mr. Fullarton, the present *primas*, should happen to die, for want of one of the college, duly authorised, to supply the vacancy until you have time and opportunity to name one to succeed him; that therefore you have sent previously this letter, to be ready and delivered to the college of bishops on the event foresaid, and that you do therefore direct bishop Irvine to reside at Edinburgh, and preside in the college of bishops until you name another to act and officiate as *primas*¹."

LOCKHART gives sufficiently plausible reasons for this commendation, to which he admits that he had been prompted, not unlikely, by bishop Irvine himself. He says, "for as the episcopal party, *which daily becomes more numerous*, are all entirely devoted to you, and that in some measure you are in the actual exercise of your regal power, in so far as they willingly follow your directions in what you require of them, it is certainly for your service to keep them entire, and at one, in all matters civil or ecclesiastical; and whilst they are in this good temper I am fond of every occasion that casts up for you to exercise your royal authority over so great a number of loyal subjects willing to receive your commands, lest an interruption thereof should make them, when they may and should appear for you, to forget their duty to you²."

THAT SMOTHERED flame to which the author of the *Memoirs* alluded, began now to burst forth. He informs us, that "the presbyters in the large county of Angus resolved to elect a bishop for themselves; some of them appeared very keen for Mr. Robert Norrie, an ancient presbyter in Dundee; others of them were as keen in opposing him: a rupture was feared, which brought the matter before the bishops, where were very warm arguing *pro* and *con*³." Some clergymen in that county who were opposed to Mr. Norrie, actively canvassed both the clergy and laity in favour of Mr. Thomas Rattray, of Craig-hall, and had prepared an address to the college of bishops,

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 118, 119.

² Papers, ii. 119, 120.

³ MS. *Memoirs*, 14.

eg of them to consecrate him. Mr. Rattray was a most
ned man, and favoured the usages, and of course those
desired him for their bishop entertained the same senti-
ts. This alarmed bishop Irvine and his party, and he
mediately applied to Lockhart to interpose the royal autho-
of which he was the depository, to prevent the consecra-
of Mr. Rattray. To allay the heat that was begun, and
ly to increase, the primate addressed circular letters to the
gy in the diocese of Brechin and also to those of Glasgow,
ascertain their sentiments respecting the appointment of
Norrie to the former, and Mr. Duncan to the latter diocese.
clergy in the diocese of Glasgow unanimously accepted
Duncan as their diocesan; but, as already mentioned, the
gy of the diocese of Brechin were divided in their selec-
of a bishop. Bishop Gadderar's adhesion to the Con-
date was only binding on himself; and a small majority of
clergy of Brechin, being favourable to the usages, declared
avour of Mr. Rattray.

THE PRIMATE summoned another meeting, and the "col-
e met in the beginning of winter." At this meeting Mr.
ttray appeared as the representative of the clergy of the
cese of Brechin, lord Panmure in the name of the heritors,
l Lockhart, I suppose, as the representative of the royal
le. The bishops were proceeding to examine the claims
Mr. Rattray and Mr. Norrie, when Lockhart interfered, and
egged to know in whom they thought the power of electing
ishop was lodged, and that he believed this was a matter
essary to be adjusted before they proceeded to such a scru-
y. Panmure, with some warmth, replied, that by the legal
ablishment of the church of Scotland, the right belonged
the dean and chapter; but as that could not, in the pre-
sit situation of affairs, be obtained, the next best method to
followed was that of the primitive church, where no bishop
uld be appointed to any diocese without the concurrence of
majority of the clergy and the approbation of the people;
in this he was seconded by Fullarton, Gadderar, and Rat-
y." But Lockhart stood up for the prerogative, and truly
ugh denied the election of dean and chapter; for the king,
said, made the nomination, and the chapter "*were obliged to
at the very person the king named.*" He strongly recom-
nded Mr. Norrie, and was seconded by the college bishops.
fter several meetings, and much wrangling, the bishops did
t several of the presbyters that were against Norrie, as having
good title, and so the majority turned on his side, and he was
ointed to inspect and exercise the episcopal jurisdiction in

these shires, by the consent of all the bishops, except Fullarton and Gadderar, who, finding they were outvoted, claimed negative power vested in Fullarton as *primus*; but being obliged to give up that point, Fullarton was prevailed upon to refuse signing the minutes¹." In the name of the presbyter that adhered to him, Mr. Rattray entered a protest against Mr. Norrie's appointment. "But at last the bishops declared Mr. Norrie duly elected; against which the Rev. Mr. Thomas Rattray, of Craighall, entered a learned and long protestation. However, Mr. Norrie's election being sustained, he was consecrated, and appointed bishop of [the county of] Angus; and about this time the bishops parcelled out the church into what they called districts, and I think it was about this time the bishops consecrated the Rev. Mr. Duncan presbyter of Glasgow²."

As soon as the meeting broke up, bishop Fullarton, the presbyter, assisted by bishops Millar and Irvine, consecrated Mr. Alexander Duncan and Mr. Robert Norrie, at Edinburgh. These two consecrations are not recorded in the Lists in Primitive Truth and Order, nor in the Appendix to the Address of Bishop Seabury; and even Lockhart does not mention the exact date of either the meeting or the consecration, only in general "in the beginning of winter." He says, however, "soon as the college adjourned, Mr. Norrie went home, and was kindly received by his friends and adherents, but his opposers continued in their bad humour, and would not submit to him, nor own him as their bishop; and the malice of the two parties increased daily, and came at length to a great height. And as the king's trustees perceived that discord and division amongst his friends would be the consequence of leaving his subjects, especially the clergy, to *act with a full powers*, they directed me to write the following letter to him⁴." This letter is dated the 8th December, 1746, wherein he says, "That the college of bishops, in virtue of the power you gave them, did immediately proceed to consecrate Norrie and Duncan *bishops at large*; and some little time thereafter, they appointed the last to inspect and have the charge of the diocese of Glasgow, and proposed to commit the like in the shires of Angus and Mearns [Forfar and Kincardine] to the other. But in the last they divided and run into the utmost height of party rage in which they were severally supported by the noblemen and

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 127. ² MS. Memoirs, 14, 15.

³ MS. Memoirs, 15.—Skinner, ii. 642 —Perceval, 254. ⁴ Papers, ii. 15.

gentlemen of these bounds. However, the majority of the bishops, seconded by the earl of Strathmore and several other persons of note that are for Norrie, settled him there, in opposition to Fullarton and Gadderar, who have opposed it and protested against it, and are seconded by a great number of gentlemen¹." The cunning minister then exaggerates the disputes that the consecration of bishop Norrie had occasioned, and advised James to write to the primate to desire them not in future to consecrate or to settle any to the charge or inspection of any particular diocese till after they have made a report to his trustees and received his own sanction. This jealousy for the "power lodged in and practised by the crown" was crushing the church, and rendering her a mere political machine to support pretensions from which God had evidently withdrawn his support. It must be remarked here, that the college scheme was the most uncatholic and mischievous that the enemies of the church could have contrived; for a certain number of bishops living in and near Edinburgh took upon them as a body to govern the whole church, and even to interfere in the administration of the primate's and the bishop of Aberdeen's dioceses, who were the only diocesan bishops in Scotland.

THE PROPOSED union with the Greek church was brought to an unfavourable conclusion this year. Arsenius, metropolitan of Thebais, transmitted the English proposals to the eastern patriarchs; but he remained in Russia, from whence he transmitted their answer to bishop Collier, with an affectionate apology for the delay. It is entitled "The Answers of the Orthodox in the East to the Proposals sent from Britain for an Union and Agreement with the Oriental Church;" and in the conclusion it is said to have been drawn up by "a synodical judgment and determination of the eastern church, after the most mature deliberation of the lord Jeremias, the most holy Œcumenical patriarch of Constantinople, the new Rome, and the most holy and most blessed patriarchs, the lord Samuel of Alexandria, and the lord Chrysanthus of Jerusalem, with the holy metropolitans and the holy clergy of the great church of Christ in Constantinople, in council assembled, April 12th, 1718." It is, says Mr. Skinner, "a long paper in Greek, accepting the twelve proposals and the articles of agreement, under certain explanations and modifications of their own; but keenly, and even with some acrimony of expression, vindicating the eastern practice in the five capital points

¹ Papers, ii. 122.

of difference, and insisting on a full conformity to it, without the least abatement¹."

AFTER THE RECEIPT and consideration of the answer of the Greek bishops, the non-juring bishops in London prepared a reply in the Greek, Latin, and English languages; in which they supported their former positions by proper arguments from Scripture and the Fathers. They concluded their letter with suggesting the following proposal by way of a compromise:—"If our liberty, therefore, is left us in the instance above mentioned; if the oriental patriarchs and bishops will authentically declare us not obliged to the invocation of saints and angels, the worship of images, and the adoration of the host; if they please publicly and authoritatively, by an instrument under their hands, to pronounce us perfectly disengaged in these particulars, both at home and abroad in their churches, and in our own;—these relaxing concessions allowed, we hope, may answer the overtures on both sides, and conciliate an union." The non-juring bishops despatched this document to Arsenius at Moscow, by the hands of James, proto-syncellus of the church of Alexandria. At the same time, they wrote to the grand council for ecclesiastical affairs at Petersburg, and to the grand chancellor Golofkin, recommending the furtherance of this negociation to their care.

IN THE BEGINNING of the following year, letters were received in answer to the despatches of the English bishops from Arsenius and from Theodosius, archbishop of Novogorod, president of the ecclesiastical council, signifying his imperial majesty's desire that two clergymen should be deputed from the English church, to confer amicably with two of the Russian clergy on the controverted points, and to endeavour to bring them to an accommodation. But before this reasonable proposal could be carried into effect, the eastern church sent a final and rather abrupt answer, in which, with some degree of haughtiness, they said they had nothing farther to say to the proposals last sent to them, than what they had formerly communicated to the British bishops in their expositions and sentiments of the oriental church. Without yielding in the least to the compromise that had been proposed to them, they conclude dogmatically:—"These doctrines have been long since examined, and rightly and religiously defined and settled by the holy and œcumenical synods, so that it is neither lawful to add any thing to them, nor to take any thing from them. Therefore, they who are disposed to agree with us in the di-

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 635, 636.

doctrines of the orthodox faith must necessarily follow submit to what has been defined and determined by the ant fathers, and by holy and œcumenical synods from the of the apostles and their holy successors, the fathers of church, to this time. We say they must submit to them sincerity and obedience, and without any dispute or scruple and this is a sufficient answer to what you have written. at Constantinople, in the month of September, 1723. ed by Jeremias, by the mercy of God, archbishop of Constantinople, the New Rome, and *œcumenical* patriarch; nasius, by the mercy of God patriarch of the great city od, Antioch; Chrysanthus, by the mercy of God of the city Jerusalem; Callinicus, metropolitan of Heraclea; ntius, of Cyzicum; Parsius, of Nicomedia; Gerasimus, ice; Parthenius, of Chalcedon; Ignatius, of Thessalof-Arsenius, of Prusa; Theoctistus, of Polipolis; and nicus, of Varna¹."

THE GREEK CHURCH, as every body knows, is episcopal; foundations of which we read in almost all of St. Paul's epistles. She maintains seven mysteries or sacraments, baptism, chrism or confirmation, the eucharist, repentance, ordination, marriage, and the sanctified oil. Of baptism archbishop Platon says, the inward and spiritual grace obtainable by faith are the pardon of original and actual sin, entrance into covenant with God, adoption, and regeneration.

In the eucharist they believe in the corporeal presence of Christ; but they administer the sacred elements in both kinds.

"I know not," says the archbishop, "therefore, I cannot answer the superstitious pope will be able to give at the day of judgment, for having, in evident opposition to the words of the Lord, taken away the cup of communion from the common people, and for giving them the communion in unleavened wafers." The Holy Scriptures is their basis of faith, but they err grievously in omitting the words *the Son,* when acknowledging their faith in the procession of the Holy Ghost. In her version of the Creed they are—"and the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, proceedeth from the Father, and with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets." The Russo-Greek church recognises the authority of the first general councils, the last of which, held in the year 753, established the worship of images; but this council is not recognised by the Anglo-catholic church. In the Greek

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 634—638.

the submission and regard they have shewn to his authority, and promising to *recommend* Mr. Rattray upon a future occasion. The letter corresponds exactly with the advice that had been given, desiring and directing them to place bishop Irvine at the head of the church upon the death of bishop Fullarton, to “reside in Edinburgh and preside amongst you, as Fullarton does, for the interim, till I may be able to send further directions to you in that particular¹.” In another letter to Lockhart he announces the birth of a son, who was immediately “named Henry, duke of York.” He was afterwards a cardinal in the Roman church, and is said to be the last remnant of that illustrious and ill-fated house.

THE BISHOPS had now embarrassed themselves with a supremacy which they obeyed as readily as if the unhappy exile had been on the throne of his ancestors, and as if he had wielded substantial power. He wrote to the bishop of Edinburgh by Lockhart’s advice, as follows, dated March 21st, 1725:—“I have been extremely concerned to hear of the variances and differences amongst you. You know how often I have recommended peace and unity to you, and how necessary it is, particularly at this time, and therefore I cannot but repeat, with all the earnestness imaginable, my former instances in that respect. I remark that the present cause of disturbance has arisen from difference of opinion as to the destination of those lately added to your number, and therefore to prevent the like for the future I shall expect from you, that before you allot any particular diocese or province to any new bishop, that you should acquaint my trustees with you of it, and inform me at the same time of the matter, and of your motives for so doing, &c.²”

A MALT TAX imposed by parliament created the utmost discontent in Scotland; and there was a very formidable riot at Glasgow, where the provost and magistrates had been very remiss in their endeavours to suppress it, and were, with a number of the rioters, committed for trial. As an instance of the clumsiness of their military operations, it may be mentioned that general Wade, in order to suppress that riot, ordered two regiments of dragoons “to be forthwith *taken up from grass*,” and with some foot, to march from Berwick! and it was supposed that these measures would occupy a week or ten days before they could make any demonstration. This is noticed in order to account for the state of such violent excitement of the whole ancient kingdom, as to induce the trustees to enter-

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 142—144.

² Ibid. 152.

tain the mad idea of hounding out the Highland clans. This intention had been so seriously entertained, that general Wade was ordered to disarm the highlanders, and take other precautions for preventing any breach of the peace¹.

ALL LOCKHART'S fine-laid schemes for the perpetuation of the college and the advancement of his political intrigues, received a severe shock by the death of bishop Irvine, who departed this life on the 9th of November². In the postscript of a letter addressed to lord Inverness, Lockhart says, "The king has 'tother day lost a faithful, useful servant, by the death of bishop Irvine, and 'twill be no easy matter to supply his place, as he was the only one of all the present bishops fit to succeed Fullarton, who's quite dozed, and can't last long. Some propose Mr. Rattray, of Craighall, and would he lay his whims aside till a more proper juncture, he's a very fit person, as he is a man of good sense and learning, and has an estate to support his rank. Others propose your and my old friend John Gillan, who's been in orders some years, and is in as great esteem as any of the episcopal clergy of Edinburgh. You know him to have been an excellent man in all respects. You shall hear from me fully on this subject when I have got the sentiments of the king's friends collected, and something must be done soon to prevent factions and divisions among men honestly inclined³."

DIVISION and schism seems to have been the fate of the English non-jurors, in consequence of their controversy about the Usages, of which we have already spoken. Bishops Brett, Collier, and Campbell, insisted upon practising the primitive rites; whilst Hawes, Spincks, Gandy, Taylor, and Bedford, would not consent. Accordingly, after the death of the three first named bishops, Spincks and Gandy being desirous of continuing a succession in their line, applied to the bishops in Scotland to consecrate Mr. Henry Doughty. The Scottish bishops, looking more to the political sentiments of their friends than to their duty, assisted in the extension of this schism that had broken out among the English non-jurors. Mr. Doughty came to Edinburgh on the 30th of March; he was consecrated by bishops Fullarton, Millar, Irvine, and Freebairn⁴.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY was allowed to sit on the 6th of May: the earl of Loudon was appointed commissioner, and

¹ Culloden Papers, 82.—Lockhart Papers.

² Appendix to Primitive Truth and Order, 520.

³ Lockhart Papers, ii. 232. ⁴ Perceval's Apology, 2d ed. pp. 248, 254.

mes Aylston was chosen moderator. The fear of popery and of prelacy, of which they had a greater dread than of the danger to their establishment resulting from their own divisions, induced them to appoint a fast-day to be held. Experience, however, had taught them that the royal supremacy *is a reality*, and that they could not now bully the government as they had done in former times ; therefore, “ the assembly having made humble supplication to his majesty for naming the day, and for interposing his royal authority for the observation of the same ; exhort all to the duties of fasting, &c., upon such a day as his majesty shall please to point ¹. ”

1726.—BISHOP FULLARTON'S health was bad, and his strength and memory were so much decayed, that he was in a great measure unable to perform the duties of his office. The prospect of his total incapacity, or death, induced Lockhart to advise his master to appoint some one to succeed him, as the death of bishop Irvine had deranged all his plans ; and whose death he laments as an irreparable loss to the jacobite cause. In recommending a successor to bishop Fullarton, he says, “ If bishop Cant was not, by reason of his old age, become very infirm, he is a person qualified in all respects to be at the head of any church in christendom, being a man of great learning and integrity ; however, he may be able to officiate for some time, till you come to a final resolution. There is another, bishop Duncan, though not a man of such parts and learning as the other, yet eminently distinguished and esteemed for his great probity, and zeal for your and the church's interest. I am, therefore, of opinion that it would be for your service that, with the very first occasion, you write a letter to the college of bishops, signifying that whereas you are informed that bishop Fullarton is become so infirm, that it is not to be expected he can subsist long, at least that it is probable he may be obliged to retire to the country for his health, and being desirous in either of these cases to provide for the peace and welfare of the church, it is your pleasure that either bishop Cant or bishop Duncan, as shall appear most convenient, do, in either of these events, reside at Edinburgh, to preside in the college of bishops, and take care of the affairs of the church in your capital of Edinburgh and diocese thereof, till you determine yourself in the choice of a person duly qualified, and agreeable to your people, to be settled in a post of such consequence with respect to the interest of both church

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 582.

and state." He proceeds to urge despatch, on account of the near prospect of Fullarton's death; and then he adds something I am sure of, that (considering the age and infirmities of the two persons I have named for *the present job*) no present bishops will be thought proper, and that, therefore, the friends' endeavour will be to find out some person with talents suitable to the charge¹."

THE AFFAIRS of the church seem to have given much trouble and the jacobites some trouble at this time in order to find a suitable successor for bishop Fullarton, whose health was fast declining. In a letter to lord Inverness, dated 17th April, he says, that the bishop had become "so frail that he has lost his memory and judgment to a great degree and is troubled with a certain infirmity which in a short time will soon end his days; but the greatest misfortune of all is from the characters and conduct of the college of presbyters. It consists of a parcel of honest enough men, but without much power and no great reach, and split and divided into parties and so that nothing is done or to be expected from the college for the real interest of the cause; and as they are all, especially the best of them, very old and infirm, they must drop in due season. He then recommends Mr. John Gillan to be consecrated. His nomination will, he says, without all doubt be approved of by all that wish well to the church and state, as he is a man of excellent sense and learning, and withal has zeal and industry to go through with what he thinks for the service of the cause, and his authority would go far towards keeping the college in due bounds. . . . I will not take upon me to recommend any particular person to succeed Fullarton, but were I to do so in my opinion, it is positively that amongst the whole clergy (bishops or presbyters) there is none nearly so well qualified as Mr. Gillan." If political prejudices had not warped his ideas, there was no man in the church so fit to succeed Fullarton as bishop Gadderar, of Aberdeen; but he was too much attached to the ancient system of diocesan episcopacy, under which every bishop has a portion of the flock of Christ to govern, and which would have spoiled all his political cobwebs. At first he continues—"it would appear natural to advance one of the college, but they are a parcel of either weak or hot-headed men, or so very infirm, that not one of them (now that poor Fullarton is dead) is fit for the post; besides, as so many of them are so infirm, the best way to prevent envy would be to advance a presbyter, or one such as Gillan (if he is fit

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 270-272.

consecrated), that is, not dipt in their cabals." He communicates the pleasing intelligence in the same letter, that lord Strathmore had made peace and friendship amongst the clergy of Forfarshire that had disputed the appointment of bishop Norrie, although some of them still stood out.

ON THE 1st of May, James wrote the letter to the college of bishops, to which he had been prompted by Lockhart, and it is nearly a transcript of his letter, in which he "desires and directs that bishop Cant, and failing him, by decease or his being rendered incapable by infirmity, that bishop Duncan should in the events above mentioned for the interim reside at Edinburgh, and preside amongst you and take care of the affairs of the church in my capital of Scotland and diocese thereof, until I be able to determine myself in the choice of a person duly qualified, and agreeable to my people;" that is, acceptable to Mr. Lockhart. The trustees recommended Mr. Rose, formerly the established incumbent of Monimeal in the county of Fife, but who at this time officiated in a chapel in Cupar, the county town. He was a brother of the late Dr. Rose, bishop of Edinburgh; but they did not intend to appoint him to a diocese until they had received James's approbation. Lockhart says, "they have some thoughts of consecrating Mr. Ochterlonie likewise, and of applying to have your liberty of setting him over the shires of Ross and Murray, where the party increases, and a bishop is much wanted¹." Bishop Fullarton was so averse to the consecration of Mr. Ochterlonie that he expressly forbade it; and the bishop of Aberdeen "objected to the promotion of a person so notoriously secular as Mr. Ochterlonie was known to be. Bishop Millar not only declared against it himself, but likewise cautioned bishop Cant to have no hand in it, as having been brought on surreptitiously by misinformation²." It is stated that "the objection to him, so far as can be gathered from the several hints which are rather mystically expressed, had a reference to the *erastian* notions which at that time disturbed the peace of the episcopal church; and this candidate for the mitre appears to have relied more on his interest at the court of St. Germain, than on the esteem of his brethren, or the good opinion of his superiors³."

BISHOP FULLARTON's health was now become so bad, that country air and relief from official cares were become absolutely necessary. The author of the Memoirs says—"In the

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 289-291.

² Skinner, ii. 642.

³ Keith's Catalogue, Appendix, 543, 544.

summer of 1726, Dr. Fullarton, bishop of Edinburgh, went to Argyleshire, where he had a small estate in land, called Greenhill. Before he left Edinburgh he appointed five presbyters by a writ, to act as delegates during his absence, viz. Messrs. LUMSDEN, RANKINE, Middleton, Blair, and Hunter. Many, both clergy and laity, were displeased with this delegation, so that seventeen presbyters subscribed an address to their bishop to recal it, and appoint Mr. LUMSDEN archdeacon; and they sent one of their number to Glasgow, where he found the bishop, presented the address, and obtained its desire. For the bishop appointed Mr. A. Lumsden, an ancient presbyter, having been minister before the Revolution, to be his archdeacon or delegate, and constant moderator among his brethren the presbyters of Edinburgh¹."

TWO LETTERS were received from the royal exile at Rome, both of which were dated the 20th of July: the first desired and authorised the college to consecrate Mr. John Gillan one of their number, for which they were directed to receive this letter as a sufficient warrant; the second required and directed the college, that when there was any vacancy in their number, to give in a list of such persons to his trustees as they might think were qualified for discharging the office of a bishop, that he might be enabled to give the necessary directions for their consecration. And he adds, "further, it is my will and pleasure that no bishop amongst you shall be appointed to have the care and inspection of any particular district without my previous authority, and that when you think an appointment necessary, that you give your opinion in writing to my trustees, to be transmitted to me as above²." Early in September, Lockhart had a meeting with bishops Norrie, Millar, Freebairn, and Cant, to whom he delivered the letters above mentioned. They promised exactly to fulfil what had been desired of them, and to consecrate Mr. Gillan immediately; and moreover they wrote a joint letter to Lockhart, dated Edinburgh, September 7th, 1726, desiring him to transmit to "his majesty" their great sense of his care and concern for the welfare of the church, and an assurance of their steadfast loyal adherence to his service, and submission to his orders and directions in all matters³.

"WHILE BISHOP FULLARTON, of Edinburgh, was absent, viz. in November, 1726, bishops Freebairn and Duncan having prevailed with bishop Cant to assist them, consecrated Mr.

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 15.

² Lockhart Papers, ii. 310, 311.

³ Lockhart Papers, ii. 318.

John Ochterlonie, minister of Aberlemno, and Mr. James Rose minister to the episcopal congregation in Cupar of Fife¹." This transaction is rather long and complicated, and therefore it will be better understood if told in Lockhart's own words, from which it will be seen that our spiritual fathers were men of like passions with ourselves, and were biassed by political and party motives, when they were acting as they asserted for the good of the church. Mr. Lockhart says—

"IN SOME OF MY preceding letters I mentioned the respectful reception which four of the bishops, viz. Millar, Cant, Creebairn, and Norrie, gave to the king's two letters in favour of Mr. Gillan, and directing the course they were to follow in the future election of bishops, and appointing such to have the inspection of any particular district, which was wisely assigned by the king to prevent such disputes as had arisen in the shire of Angus. But this good temper did not long subsist, and as this very affair was attended with many extraordinary consequences, it will be expedient to narrate it fully. In order thereto I must call to mind that at this time the peace and harmony of the church were much obstructed by two opposite factions; that of those who endeavoured to restore some ancient usages (. . .) such as the mixture of the holy eucharist, prayers for the dead, &c., who at the same time asserted the right and power of the presbyters, with consent of the populace, to elect their bishops without any dependence on the king or college of bishops; and that of the college, who were against all innovations in the canons and ceremonies of the church as they were established and practised before the revolution, 1688, and thought it their duty and interest to be in a good understanding with the crown by leaving the king (. . .) the exercise of those rights, particularly with respect to the naming of bishops, that were vested in him by the laws of the land. This diversity of opinions, and these different views, were carried on to the greatest heights, and with the greatest heat, by both clergy and laity, as they stood verally affected.

"AT THE HEAD of the first was bishop Gadderar and Dr. Strachan, of Craighall, supported by lord Panmure, in so far as he favoured the last, out of private pique to Norrie, and as he might raise and be at the head of a party opposite to the earl of Strathmore, whose power and interest in Angus were much envied. To this side, also, the lord Dunn and Mr. Carnegie, of Boissack (. . .) and most of the duke of Marr's

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 16.

of difference, and insisting on a full conformity to it, with the least abatement¹."

AFTER THE RECEIPT and consideration of the answer from the Greek bishops, the non-juring bishops in London prepared a reply in the Greek, Latin, and English languages, which they supported their former positions by proper arguments from Scripture and the Fathers. They conclude their letter with suggesting the following proposal by way of promise:—"If our liberty, therefore, is left us in the issues above mentioned; if the oriental patriarchs and bishops authentically declare us not obliged to the invocation of saints and angels, the worship of images, and the adoration of the host; if they please publicly and authoritatively, by their instrument under their hands, to pronounce us perfectly satisfied in these particulars, both at home and abroad in our churches, and in our own;—these relaxing concessions allowed, we hope, may answer the overtures on both sides and conciliate an union." The non-juring bishops despatched this document to Arsenius at Moscow, by the hands of a proto-syncellus of the church of Alexandria. At the same time, they wrote to the grand council for ecclesiastical affairs at Petersburg, and to the grand chancellor Golofkin, commending the furtherance of this negotiation to their

IN THE BEGINNING of the following year, letters were received in answer to the despatches of the English bishops from Arsenius and from Theodosius, archbishop of Novgorod, president of the ecclesiastical council, signifying his imperial majesty's desire that two clergymen should be deputed from the English church, to confer amicably with two of the Russian clergy on the controverted points, and to endeavour to bring them to an accommodation. But before this reasonable proposal could be carried into effect, the eastern church gave a final and rather abrupt answer, in which, with some degree of haughtiness, they said they had nothing farther to say to the proposals last sent to them, than what they had formerly communicated to the British bishops in their exposition of the sentiments of the oriental church. Without yielding in the least to the compromise that had been proposed to them, they conclude dogmatically:—"These doctrines have been held since the apostles, and rightly and religiously defined and settled by the holy and œcumenical synods, so that it is neither useful to add any thing to them, nor to take any thing from them. Therefore, they who are disposed to agree with us in these

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 635, 636.

the doctrines of the orthodox faith must necessarily follow what has been defined and determined by the ancient fathers, and by holy and œcumenical synods from the time of the apostles and their holy successors, the fathers of the church, to this time. We say they must submit to them with sincerity and obedience, and without any dispute or scruple; and this is a sufficient answer to what you have written. Signed at Constantinople, in the month of September, 1723. Signed by Jeremias, by the mercy of God, archbishop of Constantinople, the New Rome, and œcumenical patriarch; Ananias, by the mercy of God patriarch of the great city of Antioch; Chrysanthus, by the mercy of God of the city Jerusalem; Callinicus, metropolitan of Heraclea; Eutychius, of Cyzicum; Parsius, of Nicomedia; Gerasimus, of Iconium; Parthenius, of Chalcedon; Ignatius, of Thessalonica; Arsenius, of Prusa; Theoctistus, of Polipolis; and Theophilus, of Varna¹."

THE GREEK CHURCH, as every body knows, is episcopal; the foundations of which we read in almost all of St. Paul's epistles. She maintains seven mysteries or sacraments, baptism, chrism or confirmation, the eucharist, repentance, ordination, marriage, and the sanctified oil. Of baptism, archbishop Platon says, the inward and spiritual grace obtainable by faith are the pardon of original and actual sin, acceptance into covenant with God, adoption, and regeneration.

In the eucharist they believe in the corporeal presence of Christ; but they administer the sacred elements in both kinds. "I know not," says the archbishop, "therefore, to answer the superstitious pope will be able to give at the last day of judgment, for having, in evident opposition to the words of the Lord, taken away the cup of communion from the common people, and for giving them the communion in unleavened wafers." The Holy Scriptures is their basis of faith, but they err grievously in omitting the words *and the Son*," when acknowledging their faith in the procession of the Holy Ghost. In her version of the Creed the words are—"and the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, proceedeth from the Father, and with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets." The Russo-Greek church recognises the authority of the first six general councils, the last of which, held in the year 862, established the worship of images; but this council is not recognised by the Anglo-catholic church. In the Greek

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 634—638.

church in Russia, the priests perfume with incense the worshippers of the pictures of the saints, and the people burn incense before them in their houses; therefore they are guilty of idolatry¹.

1725.—PETER THE FIRST, commonly called the Great, Czar and Emperor of all the Russias, died on the 8th of February, and was succeeded on the throne by the empress Catharine Alexewina²; and this event proved fatal to the farther prosecution of this impracticable scheme. Bishop Collier wrote to the chancellor Golofkin, and to the ecclesiastical council of Russia, expressing his sincere regret at this melancholy event; and solicited their interest with the empress to countenance their proposed union. But the project was quashed by the letter cited from the heads of the eastern church, and it was never revived by either side. Yet, says Mr. Skinner, “ineffectual as it turned out, one advantage was gained by it—that it gave us a genuine view of the doctrines and rules of the eastern church, which in all religious disputes here in the west has been so often appealed to, but which neither party can claim full kindred with; for from their own papers on this occasion, the originals of which, we are told, were carried to Lambeth, and perhaps are there still, we find them differing from the papists in the articles of purgatory by fire, communion in both kinds, and the pope’s universal supremacy; in all which they appear on the protestant side. But then, in the points of praying to saints and angels, and worshipping of images, by the new and insipid distinction of *Dulia* and *Latria*, and in the doctrine of transubstantiation, with its consequent adoration of the host, all of which the protestants disclaim, these Greeks are as high-flown and obstinate as the most violent papist in the whole church of Rome; besides sundry other peculiarities of less importance, in which they stand single and unrelated to any European denomination [church] whatever³.”

THE LETTER which Lockhart had advised the exiled prince to write to the Scottish bishops arrived in April this year, enclosed in one from Mr. secretary Hay to Lockhart, in which his thanks are made for his own zeal and vigilance, and he is desired to let the bishops know how sensible the prince is of

¹ Perceval’s Roman Schism.—Dr. King’s Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church.—Platon, Archbishop of Moscow’s Summary of Christian Divinity; translated by Pinkerton, 1814.

² Salmon’s Chronology, ii. 154.

³ Skinner’s Ecclesiastical History, ii. 639.

the submission and regard they have shewn to his authority, and promising to *recommend* Mr. Rattray upon a future occasion. The letter corresponds exactly with the advice that had been given, desiring and directing them to place bishop Irvine at the head of the church upon the death of bishop Fullarton, to “reside in Edinburgh and preside amongst you, as Fullarton does, for the interim, till I may be able to send further directions to you in that particular¹.” In another letter to Lockhart he announces the birth of a son, who was immediately “named Henry, duke of York.” He was afterwards a cardinal in the Roman church, and is said to be the last remnant of that illustrious and ill-fated house.

THE BISHOPS had now embarrassed themselves with a supremacy which they obeyed as readily as if the unhappy exile had been on the throne of his ancestors, and as if he had wielded substantial power. He wrote to the bishop of Edinburgh by Lockhart’s advice, as follows, dated March 21st, 1725:—“I have been extremely concerned to hear of the variances and differences amongst you. You know how often I have recommended peace and unity to you, and how necessary it is, particularly at this time, and therefore I cannot but repeat, with all the earnestness imaginable, my former instances in that respect. I remark that the present cause of disturbance has arisen from difference of opinion as to the destination of those lately added to your number, and therefore to prevent the like for the future I shall expect from you, that before you allot any particular diocese or province to any new bishop, that you should acquaint my trustees with you of it, and inform me at the same time of the matter, and of your motives for so doing, &c.²”

A MALT TAX imposed by parliament created the utmost discontent in Scotland; and there was a very formidable riot at Glasgow, where the provost and magistrates had been very remiss in their endeavours to suppress it, and were, with a number of the rioters, committed for trial. As an instance of the clumsiness of their military operations, it may be mentioned that general Wade, in order to suppress that riot, ordered two regiments of dragoons “to be forthwith *taken up from Mass,*” and with some foot, to march from Berwick! and it was supposed that these measures would occupy a week or ten days before they could make any demonstration. This is noticed in order to account for the state of such violent excitement of the whole ancient kingdom, as to induce the trustees to enter-

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 142—144.

² Ibid. 152.

tain the mad idea of hounding out the Highland clans. This intention had been so seriously entertained, that general Wade was ordered to disarm the highlanders, and take other precautions for preventing any breach of the peace¹.

ALL LOCKHART'S fine-laid schemes for the perpetuation of the college and the advancement of his political intrigues, received a severe shock by the death of bishop Irvine, who departed this life on the 9th of November². In the postscript of a letter addressed to lord Inverness, Lockhart says, "The king has 'tother day lost a faithful, useful servant, by the death of bishop Irvine, and 'twill be no easy matter to supply his place, as he was the only one of all the present bishops fit to succeed Fullarton, who's quite dozed, and can't last long. Some propose Mr. Rattray, of Craighall, and would he lay his whims aside till a more proper juncture, he's a very fit person, as he is a man of good sense and learning, and has an estate to support his rank. Others propose your and my old friend John Gillan, who's been in orders some years, and is in as great esteem as any of the episcopal clergy of Edinburgh. You know him to have been an excellent man in all respects. You shall hear from me fully on this subject when I have got the sentiments of the king's friends collected, and something must be done soon to prevent factions and divisions among men honestly inclined³."

DIVISION and schism seems to have been the fate of the English non-jurors, in consequence of their controversy about the Usages, of which we have already spoken. Bishops Brett, Collier, and Campbell, insisted upon practising the primitive rites; whilst Hawes, Spincks, Gandy, Taylor, and Bedford, would not consent. Accordingly, after the death of the three first named bishops, Spincks and Gandy being desirous of continuing a succession in their line, applied to the bishops in Scotland to consecrate Mr. Henry Doughty. The Scottish bishops, looking more to the political sentiments of their friends than to their duty, assisted in the extension of this schism that had broken out among the English non-jurors. Mr. Doughty came to Edinburgh on the 30th of March; he was consecrated by bishops Fullarton, Millar, Irvine, and Freebairn⁴.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY was allowed to sit on the 6th of May: the earl of Loudon was appointed commissioner, and

¹ Culloden Papers, 82.—Lockhart Papers.

² Appendix to Primitive Truth and Order, 520.

³ Lockhart Papers, ii. 232.

⁴ Perceval's Apology, 2d ed. pp. 248, 254.

mes Aylston was chosen moderator. The fear of popery and of prelacy, of which they had a greater dread than of the danger to their establishment resulting from their own divisions, induced them to appoint a fast-day to be held. Experience, however, had taught them that the royal supremacy *is a reality*, and that they could not now bully the government as they had done in former times ; therefore, “ the assembly having made humble supplication to his majesty for naming the day, and for interposing his royal authority for the observation of the same ; exhort all to the duties of fasting, &c., upon such a day as his majesty shall please to point ¹. ”

1726.—BISHOP FULLARTON’S health was bad, and his strength and memory were so much decayed, that he was in a great measure unable to perform the duties of his office. The prospect of his total incapacity, or death, induced Lockhart to advise his master to appoint some one to succeed him, as the death of bishop Irvine had deranged all his plans ; and whose death he laments as an irreparable loss to the jacobite cause.

In recommending a successor to bishop Fullarton, he says, “ If bishop Cant was not, by reason of his old age, become very infirm, he is a person qualified in all respects to be at the head of any church in christendom, being a man of great learning and integrity ; however, he may be able to officiate some time, till you come to a final resolution. There is another, bishop Duncan, though not a man of such parts and learning as the other, yet eminently distinguished and esteemed for his great probity, and zeal for your and the church’s interest. I am, therefore, of opinion that it would be for your service that, with the very first occasion, you write a letter to the college of bishops, signifying that whereas you are informed that bishop Fullarton is become so infirm, that it is not to be expected he can subsist long, at least that it is probable he may be obliged to retire to the country for his health, and being anxious in either of these cases to provide for the peace and welfare of the church, it is your pleasure that either bishop Cant or bishop Duncan, as shall appear most convenient, do, in either of these events, reside at Edinburgh, to preside in the college of bishops, and take care of the affairs of the church in your capital of Edinburgh and diocese thereof, and if you determine yourself in the choice of a person duly qualified, and agreeable to your people, to be settled in a post of such consequence with respect to the interest of both church

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 582.

and state." He proceeds to urge despatch, on account of the near prospect of Fullarton's death; and then he adds—"One thing I am sure of, that (considering the age and infirmities of the two persons I have named for *the present JOB*) none of the present bishops will be thought proper, and that, therefore, your friends' endeavour will be to find out some person with endowments suitable to the charge¹."

THE AFFAIRS of the church seem to have given Lockhart and the jacobites some trouble at this time in order to provide a suitable successor for bishop Fullarton, whose health was fast declining. In a letter to lord Inverness, dated 30th April, he says, that the bishop had become "so failed of life that he has lost his memory and judgment to a great degree and is troubled with a certain infirmity which in all probability will soon end his days; but the greatest misfortune of all is from the characters and conduct of the college of bishops. It consists of a parcel of honest enough men, but without any great reach, and split and divided into parties and factions so that nothing is done or to be expected from them for the real interest of the cause; and as they are all, especially the best of them, very old and infirm, they must drop fast off. He then recommends Mr. John Gillan to be consecrated, whose nomination will, he says, without all doubt be approved of "by all that wish well to the church and state, as he is a person of excellent sense and learning, and without has zeal and firmness to go through with what he thinks for the good of the cause, and his authority would go far towards keeping the rest in due bounds. . . . I will not take upon me to name any particular person to succeed Fullarton, but were I to give my opinion, it is positively that amongst the whole clergy (bishops or presbyters) there is none nearly so well qualified for it as Gillan." If political prejudices had not warped Lockhart's ideas, there was no man in the church so fit to succeed Fullarton as bishop Gadderar, of Aberdeen; but he was attached to the ancient system of diocesan episcopacy, under which every bishop has a portion of the flock of Christ to govern, and that would have spoiled all his political cobwebs. At first, he continues—"it would appear natural to advance one of the college, but they are a parcel of either weak or hot-headed men or so very infirm, that not one of them (now that poor Irwin is dead) is fit for the post; besides, as so many of them aim at themselves, the best way to prevent envy would be to advance a presbyter, or one such as Gillan (if he is previous

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 270-272.

consecrated), that is, not dipt in their cabals." He communicates the pleasing intelligence in the same letter, that lord Strathmore had made peace and friendship amongst the clergy of Forfarshire that had disputed the appointment of bishop Norrie, although some of them still stood out.

ON THE 1st of May, James wrote the letter to the college of bishops, to which he had been prompted by Lockhart, and it is nearly a transcript of his letter, in which he "desires and directs that bishop Cant, and failing him, by decease or his being rendered incapable by infirmity, that bishop Duncan should in the events above mentioned for the interim reside at Edinburgh, and preside amongst you and take care of the affairs of the church in my capital of Scotland and diocese thereof, until I be able to determine myself in the choice of a person duly qualified, and agreeable to my people;" that is, acceptable to Mr. Lockhart. The trustees recommended Mr. Rose, formerly the established incumbent of Monimeal in the county of Fife, but who at this time officiated in a chapel in Cupar, the county town. He was a brother of the late Dr. Rose, bishop of Edinburgh; but they did not intend to appoint him to a diocese until they had received James's approbation. Lockhart says, "they have some thoughts of consecrating Mr. Ochterlonie likewise, and of applying to have your liberty of setting him over the shires of Ross and Murray, where the party increases, and a bishop is much wanted¹." Bishop Fullarton was so averse to the consecration of Mr. Ochterlonie that he expressly forbade it; and the bishop of Aberdeen "objected to the promotion of a person so notoriously secular as Mr. Ochterlonie was known to be. Bishop Millar not only declared against it himself, but likewise cautioned bishop Cant to have no hand in it, as having been brought on surreptitiously by misinformation²." It is stated that "the objection to him, so far as can be gathered from the several hints which are rather mystically expressed, had a reference to the *erastian* notions which at that time disturbed the peace of the episcopal church; and this candidate for the mitre appears to have relied more on his interest at the court of St. Germain, than on the esteem of his brethren, or the good opinion of his superiors³."

BISHOP FULLARTON's health was now become so bad, that country air and relief from official cares were become absolutely necessary. The author of the Memoirs says—"In the

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 289-291.

² Skinner, ii. 642.

³ Keith's Catalogue, Appendix, 543, 544.

summer of 1726, Dr. Fullarton, bishop of Edinburgh, went to Argyleshire, where he had a small estate in land, called Greenhill. Before he left Edinburgh he appointed five presbyters by a writ, to act as delegates during his absence, viz. Messrs LUMSDEN, RANKINE, Middleton, Blair, and Hunter. Many both clergy and laity, were displeased with this delegation, so that seventeen presbyters subscribed an address to their bishop to recal it, and appoint Mr. LUMSDEN archdeacon; and they sent one of their number to Glasgow, where he found the bishop, presented the address, and obtained its desire. For the bishop appointed Mr. A. Lumsden, an ancient presbyter, having been minister before the Revolution, to be his archdeacon or delegate, and constant moderator among his brethren the presbyters of Edinburgh¹."

TWO LETTERS were received from the royal exile at Rome, both of which were dated the 20th of July: the first desired and authorised the college to consecrate Mr. John Gillan one of their number, for which they were directed to receive this letter as a sufficient warrant; the second required and directed the college, that when there was any vacancy in their number, to give in a list of such persons to his trustees as they might think were qualified for discharging the office of a bishop, that he might be enabled to give the necessary directions for their consecration. And he adds, "further, it is my will and pleasure that no bishop amongst you shall be appointed to have the care and inspection of any particular district without my previous authority, and that when you think an appointment necessary, that you give your opinion in writing to my trustees, to be transmitted to me as above²." Early in September, Lockhart had a meeting with bishops Norrie, Millar, Freebairn, and Cant, to whom he delivered the letters above mentioned. They promised exactly to fulfil what had been desired of them, and to consecrate Mr. Gillan immediately; and moreover they wrote a joint letter to Lockhart, dated Edinburgh, September 7th, 1726, desiring him to transmit to "his majesty" their great sense of his care and concern for the welfare of the church, and an assurance of their steadfast loyal adherence to his service, and submission to his orders and directions in all matters³.

"WHILE BISHOP FULLARTON, of Edinburgh, was absent, viz. in November, 1726, bishops Freebairn and Duncan having prevailed with bishop Cant to assist them, consecrated Mr.

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 15.

² Lockhart Papers, ii. 310, 311.

³ Lockhart Papers, ii. 318.

John Ochterlonie, minister of Aberlemno, and Mr. James Rose minister to the episcopal congregation in Cupar of Fife¹." This transaction is rather long and complicated, and therefore it will be better understood if told in Lockhart's own words, from which it will be seen that our spiritual fathers were men of like passions with ourselves, and were biassed by political and party motives, when they were acting as they asserted for the good of the church. Mr. Lockhart says—

"IN SOME OF MY preceding letters I mentioned the respectful reception which four of the bishops, viz. Millar, Cant, Freebairn, and Norrie, gave to the king's two letters in favour of Mr. Gillan, and directing the course they were to follow in the future election of bishops, and appointing such to have the inspection of any particular district, which was wisely designed by the king to prevent such disputes as had arisen in the shire of Angus. But this good temper did not long subsist, and as this very affair was attended with many extraordinary consequences, it will be expedient to narrate it fully. In order thereto I must call to mind that at this time the peace and harmony of the church were much obstructed by two opposite factions; that of those who endeavoured to restore some ancient usages (. . .) such as the mixture of the holy eucharist, prayers for the dead, &c., who at the same time asserted the right and power of the presbyters, with consent of the populace, to elect their bishops without any dependence on the king or college of bishops; and that of the college, who were against all innovations in the canons and ceremonies of the church as they were established and practised before the Revolution, 1688, and thought it their duty and interest to live in a good understanding with the crown by leaving the king (. . .) the exercise of those rights, particularly with respect to the naming of bishops, that were vested in him by the laws of the land. This diversity of opinions, and these different views, were carried on to the greatest heights, and with the greatest heat, by both clergy and laity, as they stood severally affected.

"AT THE HEAD of the first was bishop Gadderar and Dr. Rattray, of Craighall, supported by lord Panmure, in so far as he favoured the last, out of private pique to Norrie, and that he might raise and be at the head of a party opposite to the earl of Strathmore, whose power and interest in Angus were much envied. To this side, also, the lord Dunn and Mr. Carnegie, of Boissack (. . .) and most of the duke of Marr's

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 16.

friends, did adhere, some few out of regard to those and others to thwart the king's measures during Inverness ministry. . . . The college again were supported by all the king's trustees, who plainly saw what bad consequences the common enemy put upon such innovations in the constitution &c. of the church, and judged it highly just and reasonable to maintain the superiority and authority of the college, in conformity with the rights of the crown, as the most effectual way to prevent divisions, and preserve peace and unity. On this question, especially against the usages, Millar was the most zealous and violent; he often pressed the college to proceed with ecclesiastical censures against Gadderar, and all the presbyters that did not submit to Norrie; and he could not speak with the common rules of decency and good manners, and he bitterly exclaimed against the conduct of Edinburgh's pretending to metropolitical powers as a general of St. Andrews during the vacancy of that see.

“HE WAS of a hot turbulent temper, proud and without discretion. Of a long time he aimed at having the promotion of the shire of Fife, as a step towards his being promoted to the archiepiscopal chair of St. Andrews, in which that metropolis is situated. But as the far better as more numerous part thereof declared a dislike to him, he last turned his thoughts on succeeding Fullarton in the see of Edinburgh, who being mightily decayed both in body and mind, could not hold out long; and with this view he was at great pains to gain the favour and friendship of the presbyters of Edinburgh, and succeeded to his mind in a certain set whose life and conversation rendered them contemptible. These he screened, and prevented the censures often designed against them, on account of their irregular and indecent practices in their charge. Millar having to these communicated what was in agitation about Gillan, they concluded it was with respect to his succeeding Fullarton. Millar could not but be sensible of this, and his partizans apprehended Gillan would be too strict in his discipline, and so they resolved to lay a stone unturned to prevent his consecration. In order to this, Millar waited upon Freebairn, and told him that his conscience had not been at rest since the time (that was three days ago) that he had given up the rights of the see by the answer which was made to the king's desire in favour of Gillan; and he earnestly recommended his concurrence with him in retracting it. Freebairn answered, that a

ned the promotion of one of so much merit was a service to the church, he had done nothing with regard to the king but what was his duty, and he exhorted Millar to lay aside such thoughts, which could not fail to occasion divisions in the church, and give the king and all his good subjects a bad impression of the loyalty of all who advanced such tenets. Millar, perceiving he could gain no ground on the other, resolved on a bolder step; he drew, or caused another to draw a remonstrance to the college against consecrating Gillan, which was signed by somewhat above twenty of the presbyters of Edinburgh, though some of them afterwards dilated on their names, or signed a recantation, declaring they had been drawn into it from giving credit to some assertions of Mr. William Cockburn and Mr. Patrick Middleton (. . . .), which, on examination, they found to be false. The signers of this paper were the set I formerly described; to these were added a parcel of hot-headed young men, and a few of some character, particularly Mr. ROBERT KEITH, who secretly grudged at Gillan, though a person of good age, that is above 60, yet lately admitted into holy orders, should step over them, his seniors."

THE FOLLOWING paragraph, however, lets us into the secret of all this violence and animosity, for he proceeds,—“The remonstrance was full of treason, falsehoods, and ill manners; it began by misrepresenting the encroachments made on the power and rights of the church since the reformation; it earnestly exhorted and required the college to lay hold on this happy occasion for regaining what was lost, now that the church was not in a condition to maintain them (this was a specimen of these gentlemen's loyalty and generosity to the king, and of their sentiments of the revolution which gave rise to this happy occasion, as they termed it); it accused the king of having broke the promise they alleged he had made, of not recommending any to the episcopal chair without the previous advice of the college; it contained their dissatisfaction with Gillan's character and qualifications, reserving the particulars thereof in petto to another occasion.

WHEN THEY did communicate their design, and shewed the paper to bishop Duncan, he honestly and plainly told them, that if they presented it to the college, out of regard to them he would throw it into the fire, that it might not in times appear in judgment against them. He told them they had acted a most seditious unwarrantable part with respect to their civil and ecclesiastical superiors; that as Gillan was consecrated a bishop at large, and not to any particular

diocese, they, the presbyters of Edinburgh, had no immediate concern in it more than those of any other diocese, and that this practice was a precedent for destroying all order and government in the church, and directly inconsistent with that loyalty which had hitherto been the glory of the Scottish church¹."

THIS REMONSTRANCE, which was never presented, shews that the clergy were coming to a better sense of their position and privileges, and were beginning to emancipate the church from the grievous oppression of a supremacy that had been at all times tyrannically exercised, but now more so than ever by an ideal power which could only accomplish its object through that mental debasement produced by long habits of passive obedience to the ruling powers. The college seems to have been the laird of Carnwath's creatures, and that meddler complains of the "downright malice" of the clergy who signed the remonstrance. They asked very justly what might be expected from James if he were on the throne, when he could act so arbitrarily in his present powerless condition? In short, the abuse that Lockhart heaps upon these clergymen shews the good and patriotic part which they acted, and that entertaining such sentiments the church would soon be relieved from the interference of the royal exile and his most mischievous agent. Lockhart earnestly remonstrated with Mr. Keith upon what he calls his treasonable conduct, and told him he knew how king James intended *to dispose* of the see of Edinburgh when it became vacant. It is only astonishing that sensible men and responsible clergymen would listen to such bullying, when the crimes of the revolution had set them as free as the primitive church was. But their minds were broken by oppression, and the fear of future vengeance in the event of a restoration, which they, in common with their oppressor and all the jacobites, firmly believed would soon take place. To his threats and abusive language, Mr. Keith answered, "That it was certain the state had made great encroachments on the church, and he would not say but there were some inconveniences in attempting to recover them at this juncture; yet they could not in conscience sit altogether silent; and he had authority to make two propositions for peace sake—either that the whole affair should be referred to the lord Dunn and Mr. James Graham, or that another (of an unquestionable character) whom his friends would name should be consecrated along with Gillan."

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 322—326.

Lockhart “replied with indignation, that the king was not reduced quite so low as to make a reference or composition with a *parcel of little factious priests* in the diocese of Edinburgh, who, as they were serving the covenanted cause, should change their black gowns into brown cloaks, and I did not doubt they would be received into the godly party, unless ecclesiastic should have the same fate with state traitors, in being despised by those they served¹.”

THIS INDICATES the spirit by which the laird was animated, and his rage only shews that the power which he had so recklessly exerted hitherto in subservience to political purposes, was beginning to elude his grasp. But the conclusion of this strange affair cannot be better narrated than in his own words. “During the hurly-burly, all the bishops, except Millar and Gadderar, resolved and prepared to consecrate Gillan, and in order thereto they acquainted the bishop of Edinburgh (then at his country-house at the Highlands) of what had happened, and he, in a letter, signified his approbation, out of regard to the king’s will and Gillan’s personal merit; but when it came to be put in execution, it was judged proper to delay it, there being too good grounds to fear the factious clergy would have the impudence to accuse the college to the government; and as there was an appearance of war, and in that case some hopes that something would be done in favour of the king, it was not thought fit to give the government any handle to fall upon his friends. But though Gillan’s consecration was put off, it was judged expedient to consecrate masters Ochterlonie and Rose, two gentlemen that the college had several years ago recommended, and the king had approved of; for Falconar having died a year or two ago, and Norrie being at this time so ill that his life was despaired (. . .), it was necessary that these two should be promoted, and have the inspection of Angus and Fife. Millar had formerly often proposed that these two should be consecrated, and it was hoped he would have concurred; but when spoke of now to him, he positively refused, and plainly shewed that he was now engaged in measures which he reckoned these two would oppose. There were in town only bishops Duncan and Freebairn, and as a third (according to the canons) is necessary, Mr. Patterson, of Prestonhall, prevailed with Cant to concur with the other two: and accordingly Ross [Rose] and Ochterlonie were consecrated; but next day, before the diploma was got ready, Millar and some of his crew got access to Cant, and

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 328, 329.

prevailing with him to alter his sentiments, he refused to it; however, as that did not invalidate the consecration, were owned and reputed as bishops by all except those of the faction. And this statagem only manifested to what enmity passion and envy will drive even the holy tribe, and Cant was become perfectly dozed and superannuate. The consecration highly enraged the faction; it was carried on so secretly, they did not suspect any such thing till it was over, and they saw that the party in the college which opposed their views was so much strengthened that they had no chance of making an interest there¹."

MESSIEURS OCHTERLONIE AND ROSE were consecrated at Edinburgh on the 29th of November, being the eve of the Feast of St. Andrew, by bishops Freebairn, Duncan, and Cant. The primate, with the bishop of Aberdeen and bishop Millar, refused to concur in this consecration, and bishop Gadderar protested against it, as proceeding from that source of the regal supremacy, which, although it was a shadow, yet it had important effects upon the church. Bishop Cant had promised bishop Millar that he would not assent to the consecration of these gentlemen; but he had been persuaded by Mr. Patterson, who, I suppose, was the successor of the late archbishop of Glasgow, and clerk of the council for the Revolution. He became sensible of his error the following day wrote a most penitential letter to bishop Millar, and could never be prevailed on, as Lockhart avers, to sign the instrument of consecration².

THE PROCEEDINGS above narrated gave much uneasiness to the clergy, and eighteen of the Edinburgh presbyters drew up and signed, a remonstrance against the late consecration, especially objecting to the interference of the royal supremacy in a case where it was so notoriously unnecessary and independent. Among other things, they resolutely asserted "the intrinsic powers of the church against *secular* invasion and encroachment, as being the catholic principle, upon which bishops have governed ever since the Revolution." The inferior clergy began also to feel the inconvenience of the vague, uncertain, nominal government of "bishops at large" and earnestly desired to have the inspection and government of diocesan bishops. "The clergy of Edinburgh had a

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 228-230.

² Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 642—Perceval's Apology, 254. Memoirs, p. 16. This consecration is not in the "List," nor in the Address to Primitive Truth and Order.

een happy under such inspection. They of Angus and Fife had followed the example; so had they of Aberdeen; and both of them had got proper diocesans upon the primitive footing. The college, in general, were sensible of the utility and propriety of that old and universal model of episcopal government, and began to humour the prevailing tendency which they saw everywhere towards it¹."

1727.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met at Edinburgh on the 14th of May; the earl of Findlater and Seafield was sent down as the commissioner, and William Hamilton was chosen moderator. In their address to the king, the Assembly lamented the growth of popery, and the audacity of Romish priests in celebrating mass, and officiating in all their offices quite openly. They also heavily complained of the reformed catholic church. They informed his majesty "that the non-juring pretended protestant bishops, and those who are put in orders by them, restlessly endeavour to sow the seeds of disaffection . . . and in every thing that tends to this they unite in measures with professed papists. Their preachers do not only forbear to pray expressly for your majesty, but, on the contrary, they pray in terms by which their hearers understand that none else can be meant but the Pretender. They take every opportunity to insinuate into their minds that they are oppressed under your majesty's administration, and can have no prospect of redress but from his success²." This assembly was chiefly taken up with the case of professor Simson, of Glasgow, who taught Socinian tenets; but they had time to lament over the affairs of the catholic church, which it is to be regretted did not at this time exhibit the best specimen of unity and concord. There is, says the uxorious Wodrow to his wife, "one of the most lamentable representations I ever saw of the growth of popery and meeting-houses in the north, particularly Aberdeenshire, by bishop Gadderar and his high-tylers. There is a mass-house in Aberdeen, to which the papists go as openly as to church, and near *thirty or forty* meeting-houses set up, who pray not for the king, since the last assembly. In short, in these bounds they seem to be under a jacobite government, and they are uppish to a degree on the designs of Spain and Austria . . . the insolence and openness of jacobites' meeting-houses and popery is intolerable³."

HONEST WILLISON bears his testimony, that at that time the

¹ Skinner, ii. 643.

² Acts of Assembly, 594.

³ Correspondence, iii. 294.

kirk "was in a most lamentable condition, and the wrath of the Almighty seemed kindled against her, in letting loose many adversaries at once to attack and destroy her . . . by Arian errors taught and propagated by professor Simson; by many gross errors vented by others, both presbyterian and episcopal; and by legal sermons and moral harangues (to the neglect of preaching Christ), introduced by many of the young clergy¹." Dr. M'Crie is still more minute, and actually propounds, if not heresy, at least false doctrine, when complaining of a departure from the faith:—"This melancholy change," he says, "first manifested itself in reference to the grand [and as they state it, non-descript] doctrine of justification, which was *corrupted* by teaching that the gospel is a new and remedial law of grace, which, instead of perfect obedience, requires faith, repentance, and sincere obedience, as the terms of acceptance with God. This was succeeded by cavilling at and calling in question the doctrines of election, the imputation of Adam's first sin, the corruption of human nature, the satisfaction of Christ, with other truths connected with them; and it issued in the *denial* of the proper deity of the Saviour, by the adoption and avowal of the Arian heresy; and this heresy has deeply tainted that establishment ever since²." But besides the taint of Arianism, the Assembly had to deal with what Wodrow most justly calls "a most dreadful and atrocious case." He says, "our chancellor and some others came to that height of villainy, as is said, as to *baptize a dog*, and to use the words of institution!³" This is most shocking and revolting to christian ears; but the writer of this remembers, when very young, that a substantial farmer in the next parish to where he was born, having gone to the parochial "Occasion," brought home the piece of bread, to which, as is their custom, he had helped himself, and after having entertained some friends at dinner, he called his dog, who was in the room, and taking the bread out of his pocket, said, "*Here, Cass, there is the sacramental bread to you; I will make you a good communicant!*" The dog ate up the bread, and the company laughed at and enjoyed their host's profane wit!

DR. JOHN FULLARTON, bishop of Edinburgh, died at his country house of Greenhill, in Argyleshire, in the beginning of the month of May, at the advanced age of eighty-seven. The surviving bishops were Campbell, residing in London; Gadderar of Aberdeen; Millar, Cant, Freebairn, Duncan,

¹ Testimony, p. 56.

² Testimony Ass. Synod of Orig. Seceders, 45.

³ Wodrow's Correspondence, iii. 315.

Ochterlonie, and Rose. "I am not sure," says the author of the Memoirs, "if bishop Norrie was dead; but at all events he was *ab agendo*, and bishop Campbell resided in London¹." Bishop Norrie died some time in the month of March, this year.

FROM THE REVOLUTION to this time, the apostolic church of Scotland was as much forgotten in England as if it had never existed; and although still viewed with great jealousy by the presbyterians, yet their violence had in a great measure subsided. She enjoyed external peace at this time; but within she was suffering from the ambition and secularity of her own ministers, and also from the unwarrantable interference of a prince and his agents, who were allowed to assume a supremacy to which they were no ways entitled, and which they could not have carried into effect but through the culpable submission of the bishops. The subserviency of the church seems to have arisen from the vain and delusive expectation of a second restoration; in this hope they were buoyed up by the trustees and jacobite chiefs, who calculated to bring into the field a force of their clansmen and retainers sufficient to effect it. But the mode of war had been altered, and the materials were of a superior description. It was not now, as formerly, when an undisciplined rabble of the retainers of the nobility were met by a similar force on the side of the crown, suddenly collected together by the circulation of the fiery cross; the crown had now a standing army, well disciplined and properly armed, with artillery to boot, upon which the Highland claymores could make but small impression. It was this delusion that suggested the uncatholic and impracticable scheme of governing the church by a college of bishops, when no bishop had a portion of the flock of Christ to superintend, but where every one was a governor *at large*. The spiritual interests of the church would naturally be neglected; for the vulgar aphorism would be as potential in sacred as in secular affairs—what is *everybody's* business, is *nobody's*. The bishops who were devoted to the college scheme had all been promoted through the influence of Lockhart, and of course expected to have been appointed to legal bishopricks should the crown ever be worn by James. It was, therefore, their *interest* to prevent regular diocesan episcopacy; and to keep it in this voluble state subservient to their own ambition. In short, they would soon have brought the church to ruin, and their enemies had sagacity enough to anticipate such

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 16—Lockhart's Papers, ii. 333—Skinner, ii. 643.

a consummation ; for when “ some zealous presbyterians made application to the earl of Islay, that he would move the ministers of state to take notice of such bold barefaced exercises of the episcopal office, he told them that they judged quite wrong, for that the episcopal party were *in the highway of undoing themselves, if let alone and suffered to go on* ¹.”

HAPPILY for the church, the “ ancient kingdom” became rather warm for Lockhart’s longer abode in it; and therefore about the period of the primate’s death he was obliged to seek his way over to Holland to save his head, a circumstance that relieved the church from an incubus that had unfortunately pressed upon her since the death of bishop Rose. At this period the church had the advantage of numbers on her side, and the clergy were numerous ; there were upwards of forty clergymen resident in Edinburgh and its immediate neighbourhood, and the clergy in other parts of the kingdom composed a large body. Wodrow speaks of *thirty or forty* meeting-houses set up this very year in Aberdeen ; but I suppose he must mean in that diocese, for it is hardly credible that there could be so many in the city itself, which at that time was a much smaller place than it is now. This increase in the number of meeting-houses in that diocese is owing to the presbyteries having effected the ejection of most if not of all the episcopal clergy from the parish churches.

“ THE REGULAR succession of the christian ministry,” says a late learned primate of this church, “ or, which is precisely the same thing, *the divine authority* by which they exercise their sacred function and stewardship, is not a matter of *idle speculation* or of unimportant inquiry ; nor is it liable to any portion of that derision and contempt which have been so absurdly thrown upon it. If the clergy hold their stewardship by divine appointment as well as by legal sufferance or favour, they must hold it by *succession*, since extraordinary missions have long ceased ; and if they hold it by succession, then are we connected in a very striking, intimate, and interesting manner with the very age of miracles, and with the divine Head of the church. It is not a mere philosophical club or secular society, of which we are members, which was constituted by human authority, and by human authority may be suppressed ; but a *spiritual society*, formed by our blessed Lord and Saviour, purchased with His Blood, and still governed by His delegated Power. It is a society into which we have no means, by any act or effort of our own, to admit ourselves ; and

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 330.

whose fundamental laws are not subject to our control. Christianity would still be interesting, if it were presented to us as a mere matter of philosophical history, and as affording a remarkable system and example of refined morals. But its utility would be almost annihilated, and its very essence, as a system of redemption, would be entirely destroyed. For it is obvious, that the unmerited mercies of redemption are not to be applied to us, by *a languid assent to historical facts*, however important, nor by a speculative contemplation of moral systems, however interesting. Redemption comes from heaven; and the means by which it is to be effectually applied to our necessities must come from the same source. No human efforts can merit redemption; no human intelligence can point out, nor industry supply, the means of attaining it. But if the sacraments or the mysteries of the gospel are, as they are represented to be in all ordinary cases, necessary means of grace, of redemption and salvation, it follows, unquestionably, that the authority of the ministers and stewards of these mysteries must be divine, and therefore the succession, for which we contend, *uninterrupted*¹."

¹ Condition and Duties of a Tolerated Church, a Sermon in Bishop Strachan's Chapel, Dundee, on Sunday, the 9th of February, 1806, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. Daniel Sandford, D.D. to the Office of a Bishop in the Scotch Episcopal Church, by the REV. JAMES WALKER, A.M., late of St. John's College, Cambridge, pp. 28-30.

which he was resolved to comply with ; because he owned bishop Millar to be the canonical bishop of Edinburgh, and *consequently, VICAR-GENERAL, and vested with a metropolitical right*, though he was himself the senior, and was the only local [diocesan] bishop of the province before the election of the bishop of Edinburgh. Letters to the same purpose were likewise sent to the bishop of Edinburgh from the same bishop Gadderar, from bishop Cant, who had been solicited by the four bishops to keep the meeting on the 8th, and from bishop Rattray, who, upon an election of the presbyters of the Mearns and a part of Perthshire and Angus, had been consecrated on Sunday, the fourth day of June, by the bishop of Edinburgh, assisted by the bishops Gadderar and Cant¹."

THE CLERGY who elected Dr. Rattray to be their bishop formed what was formerly the bishoprick of Dunkeld ; and therefore he was consecrated for that see. His election was almost unanimous ; and here, again, the church incurred the wrath of that "singular worthy boddie," the laird of Camwath, who calls the diocesan bishops, that had wrested the government of the church out of his hands, a set of "factions bishops." The bishop of Dunkeld was consecrated, as above stated, with the hearty consent of bishop Campbell, at London, "who had a just value for him, and had long corresponded with him." The authorities at foot distinguished by *italics* state Gadderar to have been the consecrator, after having acknowledged the metropolitical powers of bishop Millar as vicar-general². But the author of the Memoirs was a contemporary, and besides, one of the clergy of Edinburgh ; and also Mr. Skinner lived so near the time as entitles him almost to be considered as a contemporary. At all events he must have had a very accurate traditionary knowledge of the circumstance ; and therefore these two authorities are more to be relied on than any subsequent writers.

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs proceeds—"The four, called the college of bishops, not prevailing with the bishop of Edinburgh to meet with them on the eighth, being, it seems, conscious of the weakness of any pretext to be a college of bishops, even in their own sense of things, whilst they were no more in number than the bishops who would not meet with them, thought fit, on the 22d of June, to consecrate two of the dissenting presbyters in Edinburgh to be bishops *at large, viz.*

¹ MS. Memoirs, 18, 19.

² Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 644.—MS. Memoirs. — *Perceval's Apology*, 254.—*Primitive Truth and Order*, Appendix, 521. — *List of Addressees to Bishop Seabury*, 38.

Messrs. David Rankine and John Gillan ¹." Because the catholic bishops had strengthened their position, the college party thought it necessary to increase their numbers also, so as to preserve their majority. They accordingly consecrated Mr. Gillan, who had been recommended to them by the royal exile, "and," says Lockhart, "it had been much to be wished they had stopped there, and not at the same time promoted another presbyter of Edinburgh, Mr. Rankine; for as one of their objections against Rattray, &c. was, that it was done without the king's knowledge, it was a *firm foundation* to stand on²." Thus Lockhart clings with undying tenacity to the supremacy, which was destined shortly to be swept away for ever. Bishops Gillan and Rankine were consecrated, some say on St. Barnabas' day, the 11th of June; but the author of the Memoirs says the consecration took place on the 22d of June, by bishops Freebairn, Duncan, Rose, and Ochterlonie ³.

THE DESIGNED consecration of Mr. Gillan, says the author of the Memoirs, gave great offence to many both of the laity and clergy. Several strong papers were written against it, because it had been procured by *lay influence*, and because he had been but a very few years in the ministry; "yea, an address to the bishops was subscribed by eighteen presbyters, begging the bishops not to lay hands on him; and two of their number were sent to the bishops to know the hour of their meeting, that said address might be presented; but this favour was not granted. Upon the 14th of June, the four bishops, or college, sent a letter signed by them to the bishop of Edinburgh, signifying that they had adjourned themselves; and again inviting them to meet with them at time and place appointed. To this the bishop of Edinburgh answered, on the 16th, that he had not any intention to meet with them, because he had adjourned them to the 22d; and now acquainted them that he saw no occasion for meeting even on that day, and therefore further adjourned them till he should find it proper to call them⁴."

THERE WAS now a struggle betwixt the diocesan bishops and the college party for the emancipation of the church from that erastian dependence on a shadow of royal supremacy, which had produced so much discord, and was now threatening a direct schism in the church. The clergy throughout the kingdom longed for regular diocesan superintendence, and that

¹ MS. Memoirs, 20.

² Papers, ii. 334.

³ Skinner, ii. 644.—MS. Memors, 20.—Lockhart Papers, ii. 334.—Perceval's *polo*gy, 254.

⁴ MS. Memoirs, 20, 21.

they might know and recognise those that had the rule over them. In pursuance of this catholic principle, the clergy of Moray elected Mr. Willian Dunbar, formerly minister of Cruden, and whose persecution has been already mentioned, to be their diocesan. Mr. Robert Keith, presbyter in Leith, was chosen to be coadjutor to bishop Millar, who was aged and very infirm; and both these were consecrated on the 18th of June. It is stated in the manuscript that, "upon the 18th of June, the bishops of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Brechin (bishop Rattray taking that title), having seen and considered the unanimous election of Mr. William Dunbar, parson of Cruden, to be bishop of Moray and Ross by the presbyters thereof, did consecrate the said *elect*; at the same time consecrating Mr. R. Keith, a presbyter in Edinburgh, who was not elected to any particular charge; yet in his diploma he was consecrated as coadjutor to the bishop of Edinburgh, because of his old age and infirmities. This was a woful scene. The episcopal church in Scotland was miserably rent, it being in the power of those opponents to consecrate an equal or greater number of bishops *at large*, in order to overwhelm the other; by which means there should be no end of consecrating, nor of that dismal schism *of bishops at large*, each party being in capacity to consecrate as many bishops as they shall think fit¹."

LOCKHART, AS MIGHT be expected, was furious at the determined efforts that the church was now making to emancipate herself from the slavery under which she had laboured for so long a period. He says—"The factious bishops (this may appear a harsh epithet, but when I reflect how little respect they shewed to the king, and their contempt of the authority of the college of bishops, I do not know one more proper wherewithal to distinguish them from the other prelates, who were henceforth called the college of bishops), these [diocesan] bishops, I say, to strengthen their party, proceeded to consecrate one Mr. Dunbar (a disciple of Gadderar's in the north), and Mr. Keith, a presbyter of Edinburgh; but whether these promotions were one or both at or about this time, or not for some time afterwards, when Millar died, I don't exactly know, I being then abroad; and the chronology of this circumstance is of no moment, seeing, be it sooner or later, *they did not think themselves bound to ask the king's approbation; the inde-*

¹ MS. Memoirs of the Church of Scotland, 21, 22.—Skinner, ii. 645.—*List for Bishop Seabury*, 38.—*Primitive Truth and Order*, Appendix, 121.—*Keith's Catalogue*, 532.—*Perceval's Apology*, 254. The italics denote that these authors make Gadderar the consecrator, which is an error.

**TO NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY**

**ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS**



WILLIAM DUNBAR

1560-1619

1560-1619

lence of the church was now in all their mouths, and, ed, they shewed no regard for any powers, civil or eccle- ic, but in so far as they were on their side of the question. was highly displeasing to a great many, nay, the far ter part of the laity, many of whom told plainly, that as had ventured their lives for the king, they could not coun- ce a set of men who advanced maxims and pursued ures tending directly to lop off several valuable branches e royal prerogative. And so offended were the managers e most considerable meeting-house in Edinburgh, that dismissed bishop Cant and Mr. Middleton from being rs thereof [!] The first deserved some pity, in regard he a person highly valuable on account of his integrity, ing, and zeal, and that the part he acted was only to be bed to the decay of his judgment, and being easily im- d upon in his advanced age; but as the other was a fac- , arrogant creature, and guilty of many indecent irregular ns, he richly merited the disgrace he met with¹."

SHOP MILLAR was well supported in the struggle for the om of the church by the clergy throughout the kingdom; he clergy of Angus, Aberdeen, Moray, and Ross, wrote ratulatory letters to those of Edinburgh, encouraging them here to their proper diocesan, bishop Millar². To prevent reat sin of schism, and the evils that might arise from the ge scheme, the diocesan bishops held a meeting in Edin- r on the 22d of June, after the consecration of bishops ar and Keith. At this meeting there were present p Millar the vicar-general, the bishops, Gaddeiar of deen, Rattray of Dunkeld or Brechin, Dunbar of Moray, Keith, coadjutor of Edinburgh. At this meeting the fol- g rules or canons were enacted for establishing peace and order in the church:—

SEEING there can be no order or unity in any national or ncial church without a metropolitan; that all bishops clergy do own the metropolitan power to be lodged in the p of Edinburgh, during the vacancy of the see of St. ews, as being vicar-general thereof. II. Seeing all cils or assemblies of bishops are intended principally for erating upon and regulating the affairs of the flock of st respectively committed to them; that none have a de- e vote in these councils or assemblies, but such bishops as have a part of this flock committed to them by an elec- from the presbyters thereof, confirmed by the metropoli-

¹ Lockhart Papers, ii. 333, 334.

² Skinner, ii. 645.

tan with consent of the local comprovincial bishops. III. Seeing the consecrating of bishops *at large* is contrary to the canons and practice of the church, and not to be executed but from an urgent necessity in some particular and rarely occurring circumstances ; that henceforth none be consecrated into that order but such as shall be regularly elected to a particular diocese or district by a majority of the presbyters of that diocese or district ; and these consecrations to be performed by the metropolitan or his order, with the consent of the local bishops of the province, unless such urgent necessity should happen (which God forbid), of which necessity the metropolitan or local bishops are to be judges. IV. To prevent any confusions or disputes which may arise otherways about the election of bishops, each diocesan or local bishop shall appoint, in his diocese or district, one of the presbyters, who shall be in the place or stead of a dean ; and as such shall have power, whenever a vacancy shall happen therein, to convene his fellow presbyters in one or more meetings ; and to require their votes for that effect, or to take their subscriptions separately, if that shall be found more expedient, and to return the election to the metropolitan, in order to the consecration of the elect. V. That no bishop shall take upon him, contrary to the canons of the church, to perform any episcopal function within the diocese or district of another bishop, without his consent and allowance. VI. That whosoever shall be hereafter elected to any diocese or district, shall be obliged to subscribe the five canons or rules above set down, immediately before his consecration or confirmation to the said diocese or district.—(Signed) Arthur, Edinburgen ; Jacobus, Epis. Aberdoniensis ; Thomas, Ep. Brechinensis ; Gulielmus, Ep. Moravien¹.

ON THE DAY AFTER the meeting, the diocesan bishops sent some proposals to the bishops at large for the peace of the church, which were in substance — “ That the bishops at large should acknowledge bishop Millar for bishop of Edinburgh, and as such, vicar-general. That the local bishops were willing to live in good correspondence with them, and to ask their advice in weighty matters, till they should come to decisive voices by being elected by a majority of presbyters to some diocese or district, and thereafter confirmed by the comprovincial bishops. And they concluded with a solemn assurance that they have no intention to disturb the peace of the church by introducing any usage into the public worship but what has formerly been allowed and practised². ”

¹ MS. Memoirs, 22-24.

² Ibid. 25.

TO THESE REASONABLE TERMS the college bishops sent a reply on the 24th of June, in which they disowned bishop Millar's title to the see of Edinburgh, and annulled the election of the presbyters. On the 27th, the college cited the bishop of Edinburgh to appear before them on the following day, "to answer to certain facts and uncanonical practices to be charged against him with certification, &c." On the 28th, the vicar-general advised them, by letter, either to depart from the city of Edinburgh, or at least not to hold meetings or any jurisdiction within his diocese. Notwithstanding this *advice*, the college thought fit, on the 29th of June, to suspend bishop Millar, and to appoint bishop Freebairn "to be superintendent of that district, ay, and until a regular election should be made of a bishop of Edinburgh¹."

IN THIS AFFAIR may be discovered the evil effects of that species of supremacy that had been so long exercised by a merely nominal royalty, and of the mischief resulting from Lockhart's impertinent interference and political influence in a purely spiritual society. Here, says the author of the *Memoirs*, "was a miserable rent, or schism. The presbyters of Edinburgh, fearing the bishops at large would represent their conduct to their brethren and others living at a distance not in a very favourable light, caused their case to be written and transmitted to their brethren in the country, that they might be able to judge what part the presbyters in Edinburgh had acted. No sooner was their case written, than animadversions were written upon it, and objections made against their conduct, viz. that their election was precipitant, and without the knowledge of any of the bishops. To this it was answered, that the two senior bishops, Millar and Cant, were advertised of the design of electing and approving of it; and as to its precipitancy, it was answered, that Cyril of Alexandria was not only elected, but even enthroned in the room of Theophilus, three days after his death; and Proclus of Constantinople was enthroned before Maximilian, his predecessor, was interred²."

"THE PRESBYTERS in Edinburgh were agreeably surprised that their brethren in the country, upon reading their case, highly applauded their conduct, and promised them all the assistance in their power for maintaining the rights of presbyters to elect their bishops, and against the encroachments of the bishops at large; as may be seen by the congratulatory addresses from the presbyters in Perthshire,

¹ MS. *Memoirs*, 25, 26.

² *Ibid.* 27.

Angus, Mearns, Aberdeen, Moray, and Ross—in all fifty-two. The bishops who resided in the country having been long in town, went to their several homes. In the month of July, the bishop of Edinburgh sent proposals for himself, and in the name and on the behalf of the bishops and clergy of the church of Scotland adhering to him, to bishop Freebairn, and the other bishops and clergy of the said church, his adherents, offering to submit all matters in controversy or dispute between them to the earl of Panmure and the honourable the master of Stormont, and any other two laymen to be named by bishop Freebairn, with power to him to join a fifth, as they shall think expedient; and whatever they or a majority of them shall propose as their opinion and advice, for composing the difference presently subsisting among the clergy, he, the said bishop Millar, promised to comply with. But this was neglected; and thus matters continued till the beginning of October, 1727, when bishop Millar died¹.”

THE ADMINISTRATION of this worthy prelate was short and turbulent; for the bishops *at large* acted a most unworthy and uncanonical part. The offers made to them were liberal and fair, and if they had met them in the proper spirit, and if each of them had assumed the superintendence of a diocese, the schism which provoked the irreverent contempt of the presbyterians might have been healed before bishop Millar's death. His last proposal, however, though done with the view of healing the schism, of submitting to the umpirage of laymen, cannot be approved of; but its impropriety must be charged on the college party, who compelled the chief bishop to descend to such dangerous means, in order to “seek peace and ensue it.” Although the laird of Carnwath was absent in body, yet his spirit of secular ambition and regal supremacy seems to have remained with the uncatholic party, or bishops at large. It was that hankering after the external splendour of an establishment, with all its disadvantages to the church, and that arbitrary spirit which ever actuates bodies of men, that seemed to have regulated the conduct of the college bishops. But it is evident that a better spirit was entertained by the priests, whose determination to have diocesan bishops greatly supported their ordinaries, and finally enabled them to restore the church to her freedom.

BISHOP MILLAR died on the 9th of October, having enjoyed his dignity of vicar-general and metropolitan only five months. The surviving bishops at his death were, bishop

¹ MS. Memoirs, 27, 28.

ampbell, residing in London, bishop Gadderar of Aberdeen, Rattray of Dunkeld, Dunbar of Moray, and bishops Grant and Keith on the catholic side; and bishops Freebairn, Duncan of Glasgow, Ochterlonie, Rose, Rankine, and Gillan, on the side of the college¹. The countess of Kilmarnock erected a small chapel at Linlithgow, and contributed largely towards the erection of another at Falkirk; and in both of them the English liturgy was used.

THE WRETCHED college scheme soon after this became extinct, by the death of all the bishops concerned in it, and apply it has never been revived. It is difficult to imagine upon what principle christian prelates could have formed a system of government resembling a presbytery, in which the vicar-general acted as a sort of pope, in whom all the power must have centred, as the inferior clergy had none other to apply to. It was commenced by bishop Rose from expediency, and continued by Lockhart, as a convenient engine for his political purposes, based upon the fallacious expectation of the restoration of the exiled ancient and native dynasty. It is hard to say whether or not Lockhart himself really and devoutly believed in such a consummation; but he spoke and acted as if he did. He made the bishops and clergy believe that his intrigues and plots (which were all betrayed to the government) would certainly bring about that design. Bishops *at large* were therefore consecrated, in order that, when the restoration should take place, as principal secretary of state for Scotland, he might have the appointment of them to the ancient legal bishopricks. They all appear to have taken it for granted, that in the event of a restoration, the church would also be restored to her establishment, and again be "reintegrated" with the state. The state of the case, however, was now altered. At the Restoration, the inferior clergy were in actual possession of the parish churches; but now the parishes were in the legal occupation of the presbyterians, and the Union had given them a firm and invincible right to them. Lockhart asserted that the bishops derived their power and jurisdiction from the royal exile, and the college bishops but too readily acquiesced; whereas the diocesan bishops firmly upheld the freedom and independence of the church upon primitive principles; and at last effected its release from the bondage of the *regale*.

¹ MS. Memoirs.

CHAPTER LXVI.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RIGHT REVEREND ANDREW LUMSDEN,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH, AND VICAR-GENERAL.

1727.—Meeting of the clergy of Edinburgh.—Consecration of bishop Lumsden.—General Assembly.—Death of George I.—1728.—General Assembly.—Case of professor Simson.—Death of bishop Rankine.—General Assembly.—Professor Simson suspended.—1729.—General Assembly.—Declension of the kirk.—Glassites.—1730.—Assembly.—Mr. Glass's case.—1731.—Lockhart introduced to George II.—Meeting of the bishops.—CONCORDATE.—Bishop Freebairn elected *Primus*.—The usages.—Communion office.—1732.—Concordate signed.—An Assembly.—Patronage.—Ebenezer Erskine—his sermon, &c.—1733.—Death of the bishop of Aberdeen.—Communion office.—An Assembly.—Mr. Erskine's affair—their protest—suspended—their kirks declared vacant—their protest—their SECESSION.—THE ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERY.—Bishop Dunbar elected ordinary of Aberdeen.—Deaths of bishops Duncan and Rose.—Bishop Keith chosen ordinary of Fife.—Death of bishop Lumsden.—Remarks.

1727.—BY THE DEATH of bishop Millar, the college bishops had a majority of one, there being six of them to five of the diocesan bishops. Upon the 19th of October the clergy of Edinburgh were convened by their archdeacon, Mr. Lumsden, for the purpose of electing a bishop of their diocese. The author of the Memoirs again says,—“Yea, two of the bishops *at large*, viz. Rankine and Gillan, met with them, and bishop Freebairn was present *by proxy*. The election fell on Mr. Lumsden, who invited all the bishops at large, that were in town, to witness his consecration on the 2d November [being the morrow of All Saints' Day]; but none of them came. He was consecrated as bishop of Edinburgh by Dr. Rattray, bishop of Brechin, assisted by bishops Cant and Keith¹.” Mr. Skinner, the editor of Keith's Catalogue, following him, and Mr. Perceval following both, most likely, says bishop Lumsden, was consecrated by bishops Cant, Rattray, and Keith. But it

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 28.

appears, however, from this zealous contemporary, that bishop attray was the consecrator. In the list furnished to Dr. abury, and in that affixed to bishop Skinner's Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated, neither this consecration, nor indeed that of almost any of the college bishops, are mentioned.

"FROM THIS, continues the Memoir, and the preceding election of bishops by the presbyters, I think it appears pretty evident that there was not any application made for a *congé élire*, or leave to elect, whatever the enemies of episcopacy may say. No! the presbyters knew they had a right to elect their bishops, and therefore they applied for leave to them to do what was incumbent on them; though these very bishops, some short time after this, did endeavour to divest the presbyters of their rights in this and other matters. I shall take notice of it in due time. The immediate day after bishop Lumsden's consecration [3d of November], bishops attray and Keith came to him, and desired him to subscribe the forementioned paper, which had been subscribed by all the local bishops on the 23d of June, called 'Canons or Rules for establishing and preserving the peace of the church,' in which the metropolitan powers are asserted to be lodged in the person of the bishop of Edinburgh, which he now was. To which he answered, that he looked on his election and consecration as designed to promote peace betwixt the local bishops and the bishops at large, then called the 'college;' and that seeing the metropolitan powers, as claimed by his predecessors, had given great offence to the bishops at large, he was resolved not to widen the breach, but to endeavour all he could to cement divisions, and to be a happy instrument of peace¹."

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met on the 4th of May; the earl of Findlater and Seafield was sent down as commissioner, and William Hamilton was chosen moderator. The time of this assembly was chiefly consumed by debates among the ministers themselves, and the arguments of counsel in the case of professor Simson, who was accused of Socinianism. In their address to the king they deplored the increase of popery in the northern parts; which was a natural consequence of the desolation which they themselves had occasioned. Then they say, "We reckon ourselves obliged humbly to inform your majesty, that non-juring pretended protestant bishops, and those that put in orders by them, restlessly endeavour to sow the seeds of disaffection to the present happy establishment in

¹ MS. Memoirs, 29, 30.

your royal person and family, especially this last year, both in city and country; and in every thing that tends to this the unite in measures with professed papists. Their preachers do not only forbear to pray expressly for your majesty, but on the contrary, they pray in terms by which their hearers understand that none else can be meant but the Pretender. They take every opportunity to insinuate into their minds that they are oppressed under your majesty's administration, and can have no prospect of redress but from his success. By these means their followers entertain favourable impressions of popery, and are the more easily perverted to it; concerning which *we have sent* to your secretary of state *a particular memorial*¹."

ON THE 3d of June George I. embarked at Greenwich for Hanover, and landed at Vaert, in Holland, on the 7th; then he proceeded to Utrecht, and arrived at Delden on Friday the 9th, about eleven o'clock at night, apparently in perfect health. He ate a hearty supper, and among other things, part of a melon. He set out next morning about three o'clock and after travelling two hours he complained of severe grinding pains, and could not eat any dinner at Linden. He was there let blood, and again set out, being desirous of arriving at Hanover. At ten at night he reached Osnaburg, where he was again bled in the arm and in the foot; but his lethargy increased, and he died about midnight on the 10th of June. About three o'clock in the afternoon a messenger brought the information of his death to sir Robert Walpole, at Chelsea, who went to Richmond, and communicated the intelligence to the Prince of Wales, and he was proclaimed the next day.

¹ Acts of Assembly, 594.

² This is the official account; but Lockhart gives a copy of a letter which was shewn to him by Count Velling, governor of Luxembourg, which was extensively circulated in Germany, and the account contained in it believed to be true—"It seems, when the late electress [of Hanover] was dangerously ill of her last sickness, she delivered to a faithful friend a letter to her husband, upon promise that it should be given into his own hands. It contained a protestation of her innocence, a reproach for his hard usage and unjust treatment, and concluded with a summons, or citation, to her husband, to appear within the year and a day at the Divine tribunal, and there to answer for the long and many injuries he had received from him. As the letter could not, with safety to the bearer, be delivered in England or Hanover, it was given to him in his coach on the road. He opened it immediately, supposing it came from Hanover. He was so struck with the unexpected contents and his fatal citation, that his convulsions and a palsy came fast upon him. After being bled, his mouth turned awry, and they then proposed to drive off to a nearer place than Osnaburg, but he signified twice or thrice with his hand to go on; and that was the only mark of sense he shewed. This is no secret among the [Roman] Catholics in Germany, but the protestants hush it up as much as they can."—Lockhart Papers, ii. 354, 355

George II. with the usual formalities. He was proclaimed at Edinburgh and Dublin on the 19th of June, without any disturbance¹.

1728.—THE EARL OF LOUDON was sent down as commissioner to the General Assembly, which met on the 2d of May, and William Wishart was chosen moderator. In their address to the king, after congratulations, they say,—“We can have no apprehensions of what we formerly dreaded, but may reasonably hope that the abjured pretender will soon have no friend in Britain who is not likewise a friend to his absurd religion; and our faithful endeavours must, with the blessing of God, have the same success against him as against those errors which lead captive his blinded abettors into his interest against his own².” In writing to his wife, Wodrow says,—“In the afternoon, this day, Mr. Simson took some time before he brought in his papers; and the report of the committee for the king’s bounty was read, pretty long, containing most heavy accounts of the progress of popery and *jacobite meeting-houses*, which were remitted to the commission, and a representation and address seemed to be agreed upon to the king as to both these, as fit in the entry of the king’s reign³.” After Mr. Simson had occupied the time of four assemblies, this meeting suspended him from preaching and teaching, and all exercise of any ecclesiastical power. One thing, of which he is accused, and which is called “an erroneous tenet” by Dr. M’Crie, is, “that men without *revelation* cannot, by their natural powers, find out that there is a God⁴.” It is melancholy to think that men, calling themselves christians, would condemn such a self-evident truth as an erroneous tenet; for both the being and the attributes of God were revealed by Him, else we might have groped in the dark, but could never of ourselves have found out the truth.

THE COLLEGE party was diminished by the death of bishop Halket, who had been for a long time afflicted with a gravelly complaint, which increasing with years, caused his death in the month of November. He was a good, well-meaning man, but tainted with that opinion, that the bishops could only be appointed to dioceses by the crown, which induced him to unite with the college party, under the most absurd and useless designation of bishops at large.

1729.—THE EARL OF BUCHAN was sent down as commissioner to the assembly, which met on the 1st of May; and

Salmon’s Chronology, ii. 180, 181.

² Acts of Assembly, 600.

Correspondence, iii. 385.

⁴ Testimony Assoc. Syn. Orig. Seceders, 41.

there appears to have been little done, save confirming the former sentence against professor Simson. Wodrow laments the effects that this man's teaching had produced in their divinity students, whom he wishes "to be reclaimed from that *pert and bold* manner of *teaching sacred things*. . . This temper is too much growing among our students, who have an eye to the holy ministry; and our young gentry, merchants, and others, who have a little reading, are got into a most unsafe luxuriancy and latitude in their talking on these subjects. That which frights me most is our dreadful falling away as to practical, vital, and exercising religion. . . . We have a name to live. . . . Our parties, our lamentable debates upon several heads that have cast up, together with our sleeping under so much light and prosperity as we have enjoyed—these have opened the door to such declinings and departures from the Lord, as would make your heart bleed over us, did you know our present languishing state of late years¹." In addition to the foregoing, he mentions the evil that seems inherent in the kirk, of running to sacramental Occasions. It is a relic of popery, similar to their pilgrimages to shrines, holy wells, and other celebrated places. He says,—“We have many irregularities in the celebration of that holy ordinance. . . . I lie in the neighbourhood of the city of Glasgow, and we have confluences and multitudes. Perhaps I may have about three hundred of my own charge, who are allowed to partake, and yet we will have a thousand, sometimes eleven or twelve hundred, at our tables².” The first secession from the kirk began to form this year, by Mr. Glass, minister of Tealing, near Dundee, having published his “Testimony of the King of Martyrs,” advocating Independency. He was prosecuted by the presbytery, from which he appealed to the synod, and again to the assembly.

1730.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met on the 14th of May, and the earl of Loudon was the king's commissioner. Mr. Glass had been deposed, but he clung with obstinate tenacity to his benefice, and gave the courts much trouble before they could finally expel him from it. He was joined by Mr. Archibald, minister of Guthrie, who was deposed by the synod of Angus, but who appealed to the assembly³. A modern author complains,—“It was but now too evident that the worldly spirit introduced into the church, by the admission of the prelatie incumbents, and by the patronage act, had done its

¹ Correspondence, iii. 448.

² Ibid. 452.

³ Wodrow's Correspondence, iii. 464, 489.

deadly work. A considerable number of men, of decided talents, but utterly destitute of true presbyterian principles, and guided solely by regard to secular policy, had sprung up, and been elevated to the most influential positions in the church¹. In short, he asserts that what he calls "the dynasty of moderatism" was now fairly established; that is, that the kirk was now beginning to act by the rules of common sense, and this "dynasty" lasted, and made her somewhat respectable, till the late "disruption" shewed that "true presbyterian principles" had resumed their genuine form and pressure.

1731.—THE EFFECTS of Lockhart's politics did not escape even his own observation; and in one of his letters to the royal exile, he says,—“The episcopal clergy are broke and split into parties and discord; one set, headed by lord Panmure and Mr. Carneggy, seem to have renounced all dependence on both civil and ecclesiastic superiors; so that, to all outward appearance, they are in a bad situation, especially since thereby the unity which has hitherto prevailed amongst both clergy and laity of that communion, your friends, is broke and vanished².” This is a mere ebullition of spleen at finding that his influence and his “occupation” were gone, and that diocesan episcopacy was so rapidly gaining ground, as to threaten the entire abolition of his political scheme of bishops at large. George II. permitted Lockhart to return and live peaceably at home; but made it a condition that he was to return thanks to his majesty in person. Accordingly sir Robert Walpole introduced him to the king in his closet. Lockhart wanted to have declined this honour, but the king was positive; and he found himself “under the necessity of bowing his knee to Baal, now that he was in the house of Rimmon.” Neither party seem to have been much satisfied with the other, and Lockhart “made his bow and went off, well determined never to trust in his mercy, which did not seem to abound³.”

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs states, that the refusal of bishop Lumsden to sign the canons for the establishment of good order⁴, was the cause of some misunderstanding betwixt him and the other bishops. “From this,” he says, “may be dated the commencement of all the opposition that the bishop of Edinburgh met with from bishops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith, who endeavoured to thwart all his good designs for promoting peace, and gave him no small uneasiness, even in the government of his own diocese in the acts of pure disci-

¹ Hetherington, p. 206.

² Lockhart Papers, ii. 392.

³ Lockhart Papers, ii. 396-97.

⁴ Vide ante.

pline, by intermeddling betwixt him and some very irregular clergymen, who justly merited the sentence he had passed against them. Yea, they laid a project for overturning what they had declared in the paper as terms laid down, and essential to the preservation of order and unity in any national or provincial church. Accordingly they concert a meeting with the bishops at large, to be in Edinburgh, on December the 20th, 1781, to which they invited the bishop of Edinburgh who knew nothing of the designed meeting till the moment he saw them together, and he expressed his pleasure to see them met¹." It would appear, however, from what Mr Skinner says, that the college party had shown symptoms of returning to a better spirit, and they met the advances of the catholic bishops with such cordiality, that they appointed the junior bishop of their body, bishop Gillan, to meet Keith, the junior bishop on the other side, who agreed that there should be a general meeting, for the healing of these unchristian divisions. The meeting accordingly took place on the 20th of December, as above stated, and the following Concordate was drawn up and agreed to.

ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT amongst the bishops of the church of Scotland:—I. That we shall only make use of the Scottish or English liturgy in the public divine service, nor shall we disturb the peace of the church, by introducing into the public worship any of the ancient usages, concerning which there has been lately a difference among us; and that we shall censure any of our clergy who shall act otherwise.—II. That hereafter no man shall be consecrated a bishop of this church without the consent and approbation of the majority of the other bishops.—III. That upon the demise or removal elsewhere of a bishop of any district, the presbyters thereof shall neither elect, nor submit to another bishop, without a mandate from the primus, by consent of the other bishops.—IV. That the bishops of this church shall, by a majority of voices, choose their *Primus* for convoking or presiding only; and that no bishop shall claim jurisdiction without the bounds of his own district.—V. We, the bishops of the church of Scotland, have chosen and appointed bishop Freebairn to be our PRIMUS for convoking and presiding only, according to the foregoing article.—VI. We have agreed that the diocese of Glasgow shall be under the inspection of bishop Duncan, excepting only Annandale, Nithsdale, and Tweeddale, which shall be under the inspection of bishop Freebairn, together with the

¹ MS. Memoirs, 30.

diocese of Galloway, by way of district. That the diocese of Dunblane, by way of district, shall be under the inspection of bishop Gillan. That the shires of Fife, Kinross, and Clackmannan, shall be under the inspection of bishop Rose. That the diocese of Dunkeld, together with the whole presbyteries of Meigle and Forfar, the town of Perth and parish of Methven, shall be under the inspection of bishop Rattray. That the diocese of Brechin, together with the carse of Gowry, the presbyteries of Dundee, Arbroath, and Mearns, shall be under the inspection of bishop Ochterlonie. That the diocese of Aberdeen, by way of district, shall be under the inspection of bishop Gadderar. That the diocese of Moray and Ross shall, by way of district, be under the inspection of bishop Dunbar. That the diocese of Edinburgh shall, by way of district only, be under the inspection of bishop Lumsden. That Orkney, Caithness, and the Isles, shall be under the inspection of bishop Keith.—By the foresaid division of districts we do not pretend to claim any legal title to dioceses.—These Articles were signed by those present; viz. bishops Freebairn, Ochterlonie, Rattray, Gillan, and Keith¹.

BISHOP LUMSDEN refused to sign this concordate, although he “concurred with the greatest cheerfulness in all the articles of peace they had agreed upon, *except* divesting himself of the metropolitan powers, which, though he never used, yet by no means would he give up, which had been declared essential for preservation of order and dignity. Notwithstanding of this, the bishops unanimously elected bishop Freebairn, the superintendent, to be their *Primus*, and invested him with an illimited power of convocating and presiding. How fickle are some persons! the metropolitan must be subjected to the superintendent! 2”

THE FIRST ARTICLE of this concordate refers to the Usages, and permission is given to use the Scottish liturgy, but at the same time the ancient usages are prohibited. This, says Mr. Skinner, is “a distinction which at first sight may appear a little inconsistent. But it is to be remembered, that besides the points in difference between the Scotch communion office and the present English book, which are the points now called the usages, *there were some other rites* of ancient observance, such as immersion in baptism, chrism in confirmation, and for anointing the sick, and a few more of that kind, which bishop Collier and his friends in England wished to have restored;

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 646, 947.

² MS. Memoirs, 31.

and these are the usages meant in this article, and in every article of agreement where we find the Scottish liturgy allowed, and certain antiquated usages prohibited¹." This account is not quite satisfactory, neither is it altogether probable, inasmuch as the usages here mentioned were never insisted on. Sieve-wright says, that when pressed next year to lay aside the usages entirely, and confine themselves to the English office, "they excused themselves by this remarkable *knack*, 'That they shall not *introduce* any of the ancient usages into the public worship of God, for that they are *already* introduced².'" Mr. Cheyne, alluding to this concordate, says, "There were excesses, it may be, on both sides. Certain points may have been elevated to undue importance, or pressed with an earnestness disproportioned to their relative value; but it does seem that the party who aimed at restoration displayed upon the whole a forbearance becoming the character of christian bishops and priests. They stood, as they were justified in doing, upon their right to exert the privileges of their office, so far as it was restrained by no law of the church, and employ its influence in regaining those doctrines and rites which had been lost, or too much withdrawn from view; but they did not press them upon the unprepared or unwilling, they forced them upon no one, they insisted only that they had a right to use them themselves; because all of them they considered as important, and some as necessary; but they left other bishops free to adopt and practise them or not, as they might gain light and conviction. This freedom, however, they could not obtain for themselves. Their opponents, too much in the spirit of those who follow them in our own day, were disposed to grant no toleration: they proposed a new test, and endeavoured to exact from all the clergy in the kingdom a pledge, that they would never receive nor practise any of the obnoxious doctrines and rites. Such tyrannical violence, which condemned antecedently to examination, defeated itself, and served to awaken attention to those very subjects which it was intended to suppress. The conflict for a time was fierce, but the opposing parties at last came to an adjustment, guaranteeing to each other that liberty which it would have been happy for them had they granted from the first³."

1732.—THIS CONCORDATE happily put an end to the absurd

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 647, Note.

² Letter from Bishop Freebairn to Bishop Ochterlonie, dated 17th July, 1732, cited by Sieve-wright, Principles, &c. p. 285.

³ Communion Office Vindicated, pp. 32, 33.

college party as bishops at large, which began in a supposed political necessity, kept the church in confusion and animosity, and, if it had continued much longer, would have ended in a formal schism. Perhaps that which prevented such a calamity was the firm adherence of the inferior clergy to the primitive model, the great majority, if not the whole, of whom, would have preserved their allegiance to their diocesan bishops. The bishops of Glasgow, Duncan; of Fife, Rose; and of Moray, Dunbar, signed the concordate when it was sent to them in the course of this year; and bishop Gadderar, of Aberdeen, signed it at Old Aberdeen on the 13th of May¹.

THE ASSEMBLY met on the 4th of May, and the marquis of Lothian sat as commissioner. On the 15th they passed an act "anent the method of planting vacant churches," to come into operation "until it shall please God in his providence to relieve this church from the *grievances* arising from the act restoring patronages²." But when the patron allowed the time to elapse, the elders and heritors of the parish, who were often episcopalians, had the power of choosing and presenting a minister; and it seems the Assembly was very despotic in enforcing these settlements. They refused dissentients the privilege of petitioning, and therefore "a doctrinal testimony from the pulpit was now the only means by which ministers could exonerate themselves in communion with the established church; and of this also they were deprived³." This despotism of the Assembly occasioned a large and most formidable schism from the kirk, known by the name of THE SECESSION. At the meeting of the synod of Perth at Stirling in October, Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, one of the ministers of Stirling, was appointed to preach *ad ministros*. He took up his testimony, and inveighed against the defections of the times, but particularly against the late act of Assembly, and the violent consequent settlements. For these freedoms the synod rebuked him; but against their sentence Erskine protested, and appealed to the Assembly; and twelve of the ministers of this synod adhered to his protest⁴.

1733.—BISHOP GADDERAR died at Aberdeen in the month of February. Mr. Cheyne, citing the words of bishop Gerard, says, "He was buried very decently [*i. e.* respectably], and with some solemnity, in bishop Scougal's grave; and the Sunday after, our worthy people in these towns [Old and New

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 647.

² Acts of Assembly, p. 620-21.

³ Testimony of Associate Synod of Original Seceders, 47.

⁴ Ibid. 47.

Aberdeen] made such a liberal and frank oblation as payed his little debt, and cleared the charges of his funeral¹." He used the communion office as it stands in the Scottish prayer-book of 1637, and had some hundred copies printed for the use of his diocese; but he cast it into the order in which it is now used, by marking the order on the back of the title-page with a pen for his own and his clergy's direction, and several of the laity followed their example. So that the Scottish communion office, as we have it now, may be traced back to the year 1723, when this worthy prelate, of blessed memory, was elected bishop of Aberdeen. "Bishop Gadderar, in arranging the communion office for his own diocese, violated no law of the church, either general or provincial; no liturgy was prescribed by canon; he neither transgressed the just grounds of his own authority, nor departed from the analogy of faith, nor innovated upon the catholic forms of worship, but rather restored what the hand of modern innovation had in a measure defaced. In this affair the good bishop acted for himself alone and his own diocese; he did not even enjoin the use of it upon his own clergy, much less endeavour to impose it upon other bishops. Yet in a few years his revision of the office found its way into general use; the doctrines which he witnessed spread, and when the influences which had raised up an adverse or anti-catholic party ceased, and the voice of the church was permitted to be heard, men of higher and sounder views were elevated to the episcopate, and the office which had been at first the liturgy of one diocese, became the 'communion-office for the use of the church of Scotland².'"

THE ASSEMBLY met on the 3d of May, and the marquis of Lothian was sent down as the commissioner. The affair of Erskine came before the meeting, when an act was passed "for preserving the subordination of the judicatories of the church, and good order therein;" in which the sentence of the synod of Stirling was approved, and a rebuke and admonition were ordered to be pronounced against the appellant³. Against this sentence Mr. Erskine and his adherents again protested, asserting their liberty to preach the same truths, and to testify against the same or the like defections upon all proper occasions. The protesting brethren refused submission to the Assembly's rebuke as being an undue restraint upon ministerial freedom;

¹ Cheyne's Vindication, 27.

² Ibid. 26-30.

³ Act v. Session 10.

and presented a protest to the Assembly, which that court refused to receive, but which the brethren laid on the table, and retired. A member afterwards accidentally took up the protest, read it, and called the attention of the court to its contents. The Assembly declared it an insult to the court, and a committee was appointed to communicate with the offenders. The committee reported that the brethren continued fully resolved to adhere to their protest. They were cited to the bar, and, without permitting the offenders to speak, the Assembly, by a great majority, ordained "that the brethren should appear before the commission in August next, and then shew their sorrow for their conduct and misbehaviour in offering to protest, and in giving in to this Assembly the paper by them subscribed; and that they then retract the same¹." In case they should refuse to retract, &c. the commission was empowered and appointed to suspend them from the exercise of their ministry. And if they continued obstinate, the commission was instructed to proceed to a higher censure. Against this sentence the four brethren requested leave to read a complaint and declaration; but the Assembly peremptorily refused to hear it, and therefore they laid it on the table and left the bar. No change having taken place in the resolution of the four brethren, the commission suspended them in August, when the brethren again protested. In November, a committee that had been appointed to interrogate them reported that the brethren had exercised all the parts of their ministerial office as if they had not been under censure, and that they had declared their resolution to continue of the same mind as formerly. Although many presbyteries and private parties petitioned the commission to suspend their judgment till March, 1734, yet they determined to proceed to the higher censure; and accordingly pronounced the following sentence. The commission "did and do loose the relation of Mr. Ebenezer Erskine" and his associates, "to their respective charges; and do declare them no longer ministers of this church: and do hereby prohibit all ministers of this church to employ them, or any of them, in any ministerial function. And the commission do declare their churches *vacant* from and after this sentence²."

THE ASSOCIATED BRETHREN, who were now by new adhesions increased to seven, protested that, notwithstanding this sentence, their pastoral relation should be held and reputed firm and valid: "That notwithstanding our being cast out

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 625.

² Gibbs' Display.

from ministerial communion with the established church of Scotland, we still hold communion with all and every one who desire with us to adhere to the principles of the true presbyterian covenanted church of Scotland, in her doctrine, worship, government, and discipline; and particularly with every one who is groaning under the evils, and who are affected with the grievances we have been complaining of, who are in their several spheres wrestling against the same. But in regard that the prevailing party in this established church, who have now cast us out from ministerial communion with them, are now carrying on a course of defection from our reformed and covenanted principles, particularly are suppressing freedom and faithfulness in testifying against the present blackslidings of the church, and inflicting censures on ministers for witnessing by protestations and otherwise against the same; therefore we do, for these and many other weighty reasons, to be laid open in due time, protest that we are *obliged to make a SECESSION from them*, and that we can have no ministerial communion with them, till they see their sins and mistakes, and amend them. And we hereby appeal unto the first, free, faithful, and *reforming* General Assembly of the church of Scotland." Signed by the brethren. On the 6th of December, the seven brethren met at Gairney-bridge, near Kinross, and constituted themselves a separate presbytery, and assumed the denomination of the ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERY¹.

BY A MANDATE from the bishops, the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen met at Old Meldrum, a town in that diocese, about eighteen miles northwestward of that city, on the 5th of June, for the purpose of electing a successor to the late bishop Gadderar; and their choice fell upon Mr. William Dunbar, bishop of Moray. Bishop Dunbar accepted the charge of the diocese of Aberdeen, and soon after resigned the bishoprick of Moray². Bishop Duncan of Glasgow died in that city in the month of January; and bishop Rose died at Cupar in Fife, in the month of June. The clergy of the diocese of Fife almost immediately elected bishop Keith to be their diocesan, and he assumed the administration of that diocese.

BISHOP LUMSDEN was exceedingly displeased at the election of bishop Freebairn to the office of *Primus*; for he in common with others thought that the bishops of Edinburgh were vice-metropolitans during the vacancy of the see of St.

¹ Gibbs' Display.—Testimony of the Associate Synod of Original Seceders.—Brown's Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Secession.—Wilson's Testimony.—Author's Book of the Constitution.

² MS. Memoirs, 31.

ws. He never acted cordially with his brethren ; but attempted to act independently of their advice. They in consequence much displeased, and were resolved to unite with him. For this purpose, bishop Freebairn, *in*us, summoned all the bishops to meet in Edinburgh 19th of June. But it pleased God to remove bishop Len on the morning of the very day of the meeting ; which event whatever misunderstanding might have arisen between them was prevented.

UNTOWARD disputes that had taken place among the high prelates arose entirely from the influence of Mr. Lockhart over the clergy, who had been so long subjected to the sight of the *Regale*, that they did not imagine it possible for the church to exist without it. Lockhart had so many resources in hand for the restoration of the exiled family, that he himself never doubted that James would eventually be seated on the throne of his ancestors. He communicated this spirit to the clergy, nothing loath, and they were filled up with the hopes with which he fed them ; consequently they thought it would be highly indecorous for them to refuse bishopricks which they imagined could only be conferred on them by *congé d'élire*. No sooner, however, did the government intercept Lockhart's correspondence with the king and had set those springes to catch that agile gentleman than he fled him to make his escape beyond sea, than a better system began to manifest itself among the bishops. The consequence was the result. The wild, uncatholic college scheme was broken up for ever ; the bishops " at large " became bishops of dioceses, they possessed jurisdiction, and each became the shepherd of an allotted portion of the scattered flock of Christ. In some measure was the effect, under God, of bishop Lockhart's firmness, and his " stern and fearless integrity." Though the system of a college of bishops was uncatholic, and unprecedented in the universal church, yet these bishops were duly consecrated, and held a part of that one episcopate which overspreads the whole earth. May our sins, and the offences of our forefathers, be blotted out of the book of His remembrance ! seeing they were compassed by infirmity, having their treasure in earthen vessels. Being overcome by like passions with ourselves, they suffered themselves to be deceived by the cunning craftiness whereby Lockhart deceived them with visionary prospects of the kingdoms of this world and with the glory of them.

CHAPTER LXVII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. DAVID FREEBAIRN,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1733.—A synod—Freebairn elected bishop of Edinburgh—some rules canons.—1734.—A synod proposed.—1735.—Death of the bishop Dunblane.—Mr. Robert White chosen bishop—consecration of bishop W.—1736.—The seceders.—1737.—Mr. Hay elected to the bishopric Moray—not consecrated.—Spirit of discord.—Porteous mob.—A proclamation.—1738.—Mr. Spens.—A protest by bishop Keith.—A synod appointed—adjourned—broken up.—Another synod—bishop Dunbar's instructions—bishop Rattray elected *primus*—transactions of the synod—its dissolution—General Assembly.—The seceders.—1739.—A General Assembly—seceders summoned—finally separate from the establishment.—Death of bishop Freebairn.

1733. — NOTWITHSTANDING the death of the bishop of Edinburgh, the synod was held on the day appointed. There were present the bishops Freebairn, Ochterlonie, Rattray, Gillan, and Keith. "Bishop Dunbar sent an excuse¹." The first transaction was to direct the clergy of Edinburgh to elect a successor to their deceased bishop; but they replied, 'It was too precipitate to set about so weighty an affair so soon after his death. Great clamour and noise, they said, were raised about bishop Millar's election, and therefore it was thought it not prudent to give any ground for fresh misrepresentation. To which bishop Rattray replied, in the name of his brethren, "That since the bishops were in town, a mandate could be easily given by the *primus* to warrant the election; whereas if they should leave the city, they lie far scattered from one another, and could not so readily advise a thing of this nature as when met together." The clergy agreed to make an election; and the *primus* immediately issued his mandate for the election to be on the 28th of the same month. C

¹ MS. Memoirs.

that day the presbyters unanimously elected bishop Freebairn, *primus*, to be their diocesan ; and on its intimation to the synod, the bishops immediately confirmed the election. “So that the same person whom they had chosen their *primus*, with limited powers of consecrating and presiding, is now, as bishop of Edinburgh, vice-metropolitan¹.”

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs proceeds :—“It was thought that by this election peace was rivetted, and that all heats and factions would cease. But some persons, like the salamander, must be always in the fire. While bishop Keith was a presbyter, yea, some time after his consecration, he has been often heard to say, there never would be peace among the presbyters in Edinburgh so long as there were any other bishops residing among them but their own proper bishop, and that the bishop of Edinburgh ought to discharge them from his diocese. This appeared evident from his own practice, for when there was no other bishop residing in Edinburgh except himself and bishop Gillan, it is well known what heats and factions they kept up, especially in Mr. Maben’s affair. At this meeting the bishops agreed on four articles [as follows] relating to the conduct of the presbyters ; they are not called canons, and I know not what to call them ; it is no matter, for they were never observed².”

“I. THE BISHOPS of the church, taking into their serious consideration the desolate state and condition of many places in the country, for want of clergymen to minister in holy things, and that no other method casts up for the immediate supply of the country but by temporary missions from the city of Edinburgh, until the vacant congregations can be otherwise provided, have thought fit that no single meeting-houses shall be allowed within the city of Edinburgh or town of Leith after the term of Whitsunday 1784 [25th of May], that so, after that term, ministers may be more easily spared to go into the country, be south of the river Tay, for the space of one, two, or three months, according to lot ; and every minister who goes into the country from the city of Edinburgh (out of which mission, the bishops residing and keeping meeting-houses here are excepted) shall not only have the emoluments of his own meeting-house preserved to him, and his charge there supplied during his mission, but shall likewise receive a proportional share of the emoluments of the place in the country where he goeth to supply ; and if any presbyter happen to

¹ MS. Memoirs, 32.

² Ibid. 32, 33.

be refractory, he shall be deprived of all office and charge within the city of Edinburgh and town of Leith.

II. IN ORDER to prevent irregular marriages, we earnestly recommend proclamation of banns to be made in the parish churches, and do appoint that the certificate of the banns be produced to the bishop of the place by one friend, at least, of both parties intending to be married, that they may likewise obtain a license to some presbyter to join the persons in holy matrimony; without which license no presbyter whatsoever shall be at freedom to proceed in the marriage.

III. THE PERSON that dilates a clergyman for an irregular marriage to his bishop, must take upon him to make good the accusation, either by producing the marriage lines or by competent witnesses. If the accuser be a clergyman, and shall not make out the accusation brought by him against his brother, he shall be censured by the bishop; and this and all other processes are hereby declared to proceed before the bishop alone, or if he shall be pleased to take the advice of four or five presbyters whom he shall think fit to choose; and all processes before any bishop are declared to be in writing and each page to be subscribed by the clerk, and every panel to have all he desires, without exception, in the process.

IV. TO STRENGTHEN the discipline in the hands of ministers, it is appointed that no minister of any episcopal congregation within this national church shall accept any person into his congregation from another, without a sufficient testimonial from his former minister of his good and christian behaviour during his retaining to him; and that the minister transgressing this order shall be censured for the first fault, at the discretion of the bishop; and if he fall into a second fault, he shall be suspended.—*Sic subscribitur*, D. Freebairn bishop; John Ochterlonie, bishop; A. Rattray, bishop John Gillan, bishop; Robert Keith, bishop¹.

1734.—IN THE MONTH of March, the primate wrote to bishops Rattray, Dunbar, Gillan, and Keith, that the affair of the church required that there should be an episcopal synod held, but that he would not fix the meeting until he knew what time would best suit their convenience. Bishop Dunbar, in reply to this circular, wrote, "That his age and infirmities would not allow him to travel so far till after Trinity Sunday." On receipt of bishop Dunbar's letter, the primate altered the date of the meeting to the third day of

¹ MS. Memoirs, App. p. 67-69.

July¹. Mr. Skinner says, that bishop Freebairn “still retained a tincture of the old political leaven, and attachment to established forms; and having, by means of his son, who was in great favour abroad, got hold of some papers which he was fond of, he called a meeting of all the bishops in 1734; but they suspecting the design, and not choosing to be longer entangled with any thing of that nature, declined the meeting, and would not so much as look at his papers, when young Freebairn offered a private sight of them².” When bishop Keith received the primate’s intimation that he had changed the day of meeting, “he resolves to baulk it, and procures proxies from bishops Rattray and Dunbar to give in declinatures in their names against the meeting; which he does, and joins with them his own declinature; bishop Gillan giving likewise his, alleging, that though they had made him primus, with a power of convocating his brethren, yet it was only when *they desired him*.” However, continues my author, “He has clear eyes who can see this in the articles of peace they all had signed on December 31st, 1731. But this short-lived peace must be at an end³.”

1735.—THE BISHOP OF DUNBLANE, Mr. Gillan, died on the 3d of January. He was a man of great learning, and an eminent preacher. He wrote the Life of Bishop Sage, including Remarks on Sir James Dalrymple’s Historical Collections; and a Vindication of the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery. On the 18th of March the clergy of Dunblane met together, and chose Mr. Robert White, presbyter at Cupar in Fife, to be their bishop, and addressed letters to the bishops, requesting them to consecrate this most worthy priest, now the elect of Dunblane. The bishops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith, requested the primate to call a meeting for consecrating Mr. White. My author rather uncharitably asserts, that their declinatures to the former synod “were, no doubt, designed to prevent the primus from calling any other meeting, that they might have the sole direction of ecclesiastical affairs in their own power. I do think they concluded that the bishop of Edinburgh, being dissatisfied with their declinatures, would not call a meeting at their desire; for the three bishops, Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith, sent each of them a letter to the primus to call a meeting as soon after Pentecost [Whitsunday] 1735 as possible, in order to consecrate Mr. Robert White to take inspection of the district of Dunblane. . . . The primus, not doubting but that they were dissatisfied with their former

¹ MS. Memoirs, 33.² Ecclesiast. Hist. ii. 648.³ MS. Memoirs, 33.

declinatures, indicted a meeting at Edinburgh on the 18th day of June, and timeously advertised them all of it; which I am apt to think did not a little surprise them, for they had agreed to meet by themselves by-north Tay, in Angus, to which meeting bishop Keith set out in a few days after he was acquainted by the primus of his having called a meeting on the 18th of June, and bishop Dunbar did not leave his own house, in Peterhead, till that very day, the 18th of June, when he should have been in Edinburgh, and came to bishops Rattray and Keith in Angus [Forfarshire]¹." But being apprised, says Mr. Skinner, "by undoubted information, that though the primate consented to call the meeting, he had no intention to forward the consecration, but only to lay before them his son's foreign papers, which they were still determined not to meddle with, they wisely resolved not to meet with him at Edinburgh, except for the sole purpose of the proposed consecration; and being now the majority who, by the late agreement, and by bishop Fairbairn's own repeated acknowledgments, had the administration in their hands, they called Mr. White to attend them at Carsebank, near Forfar, and consecrated him there on the 14th [should be 24th] of June, 1735²." "And these three," bishops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith, "did, on the 24th of June, at Carsebank, consecrate Mr. Robert White, after having received protestations against his consecration from their primus and bishop Ochterlonie³."

"THIS UNACCOUNTABLE conduct of the three bishops was very surprising; as, indeed, several other steps of their conduct were, all which were fully set forth in a long and strong paper called 'The Admonition and Remonstrance of the Bishop of Edinburgh;' a subscribed copy of which was sent to each of these three⁴." Mr. Skinner says, that this "warm remonstrance was properly answered by the other side; and some other differences ensued, at the instigation of bishop Ochterlonie, who still sought to keep up the division⁵." In the appendix to a small book by one Sievewright, it is stated that bishop White was consecrated "because he was a fiery Usage-man, and a violent stickler against the English communion office; and so a proper tool for their work⁶." In the work itself, Sievewright says, that "this mock consecration was performed in the meeting-house of Mr. David Guth-

¹ MS. Memoirs, 33, 34.

² This consecration is also attested in Prim. Truth and Order, App. 522.—List, &c. p. 38.—Perceval's Apology, 254.—Keith's Cat. 547.

³ MS. Memoirs.—Eccles. Hist. ii. 449.

⁴ MS. Memoirs

⁵ Hist. ii. 649.

⁶ Sievewright's Principles, &c. App. 314.

rie, about a mile to the eastward of Forfar, upon Tuesday, the 24th of June¹ ;” being the festival of the nativity of St. John the Baptist. This gentleman proceeds,—“ After promoting Mr. White, the usagers acted more openly, as I have hinted; but to smooth the two old bishops [Freebairn and Ochterlonie], Mr. Dunbar (no doubt instructed by his brethren) proposed some overtures of accommodation to them, in harvest that same year, 1735, which were rejected. The first and chief of these was, ‘ That every minister shall be left to his own freedom to bring in the ancient usages or not, as he thinks fit ;’ but this had too much in it of the appearance of an insulting banter, for the old resolute men to give ear to it, and so had no other effect but to poison the old wound still more and more². ”

1736.—AFTER waiting for several years, and finding that the established courts were still proceeding in the same course that had caused the Secession; and, at the same time, that they were most inconsistently making declarations against the intrusion of ministers upon congregations that were reluctant to receive them, they were sanctioning such intrusions by their own decisions; the associated ministers, who were now denominated *seceders*, resolved, without farther delay, “ to act in a judicative capacity, by granting the dispensation of divine ordinances to such as applied for it—settling the terms of their fellowship—and asserting the genuine principles and attainments of the church of Scotland.” They published a judicial testimony to the principles and attainments of the church of Scotland; an enlargement of their Testimony on the head of the doctrine of grace. They renewed the covenants, and enjoined that all who were admitted to the ministry should previously take the oath of the covenant; which was not lawful for the established kirk to do³.

1737.—THE PRIMATE sent a mandate to the clergy of the dioceses of Moray and Ross, to elect one of their number to succeed to bishop Dunbar. On the 7th day of July the clergy of these two dioceses met together accordingly, in the city of Elgin, and elected the rev. George Hay, minister of the reformed catholic chapel at New Dervie, or Daviot, in Nairnshire, in the diocese of Moray. Mr. Hay was never consecrated, because he was disposed to have revived the uncatholic scheme of the college of “ bishops at large.” He was, therefore, very acceptable to the primate and to bishop Ochterlonie; but the

¹ *Sievwright's Principles, &c.* App. 287.

² *Ibid.* 290.

³ *Testimony of Orig. Seceders*, 50.

former could never prevail on bishops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith, to assist him in the consecration¹. Bishop Ochterlounie was so anxious to increase the number of the bishops at large, that he urged the primate “to consecrate Mr. Hay by themselves (two) in their necessitous case;” and also “the first candidates they could procure for episcopal consecration. But Freebairn declined the proposal. Neither would any of the candidates themselves, viz. Messieurs Hay, Harper, Auchterleck, and Oglevie, be consecrated by two².”

THE SPIRIT of discord seems at this time to have been peculiarly at work in Scotland. The church was divided within herself, and the establishment was rent in twain by a most formidable secession, which increased every year. A number of ministers presented a petition to the Assembly, begging the court to address the king and parliament against several grievances of which they complained, but especially against “the *toleration* established in Scotland, whereby error, superstition, and profaneness, are greatly encouraged, and church discipline—the establishment of patronages—the not received addresses from this church to the House of Peers, because *not directed to the lords spiritual*—the introducing a new form of swearing by laying the hand upon and kissing the gospels³.” Notwithstanding all “the awful rebukes” that, Willison says, the kirk experienced at this time, “she neither amended her ways and doings, nor turned to the Lord; wherefore we find the hand of the Lord stretched out against her still, and a new sharp trial carved out for her from an airth [point of the compass] that none could have expected.” This sharp trial was the Porteous mob, so beautifully and correctly described by Sir Walter Scott, in his tale of the Heart of Midlothian, and to which I refer my readers for the particulars. The ringleaders of this mob could never be discovered either then or since. The government took an extraordinary method to discover them, by compelling the established ministers to read a proclamation from their pulpits every Sunday during a whole year. The penalty for disobedience was, “that they shall be declared *incapable of sitting or voting in any church judicatory*;” and this was to be executed against them by the civil judges⁴. This was most obnoxious to the ministers, for they considered that the penalty was properly an ecclesiastical censure, and the civil magistrate taking it into his own hands, they called an assumption

¹ MS. Memoirs, 35.

² Sievewright's Principles, 289, 290.

³ Willison's Testimony, 67.

⁴ Ibid. 93, 94.

tion of the power of the keys, and a manifest encroachment on the headship of Christ. It was to divest the ministers, they said, of the power of church government and discipline, “which is as essential to their office as preaching or dispensing the sacrament¹.” To be sure it was. It is scarcely credible, says Mr. Skinner, “what a ferment this raised among them. All, in one voice, cried out against it, as a most flagrant encroachment on the church. But though they were all of one mind in condemning this injunction, they differed in their practice about it. Some, *for fear*, read the proclamation as required, though with great reluctance, and not without much scruple; some shifted the reading of it from themselves, and put it upon their precentors; and a great number paid no regard to it at all, and would neither read it from their pulpits nor allow it to be read in their kirks in any shape.²” This is only retributive justice on the kirk for their having procured a proclamation at the Revolution, to be a snare to the clergy, and to be the means of turning them out of their livings. Had they universally refused to have read it, the kirk would have been at an end; there would have been no more assemblies, presbyteries, nor even kirk sessions. Talk of erastianism! But as it was, it emptied a good many of the kirks, for the courageous among them, that would not read the proclamation, joined the secession, and strengthened it both with ministers and people.

1738.—THE DISPUTES between the catholic bishops and the college, or bishops at large, had produced feelings of jealousy, and even of animosity, unbecoming the episcopal character, and led them sometimes to interfere in the affairs of each other's dioceses in an uncanonical manner. A Mr. Spens, belonging to the diocese of Fife, applied to Mr. Keith, his own proper diocesan, for ordination. The bishop had seen sufficient reason to defer his ordination; but, in the meantime, Mr. Spens applied to the bishop of Edinburgh, who appointed him to be examined before the clergy of his diocese; and having passed creditably, bishop Freebairn put him into deacon's orders. Bishop Keith resented this irregular transaction, and refused to institute Mr. Spens to the chapel at Wymess, in his diocese of Fife, till after Mr. Spens, who was sensible of the impropriety of his ordination, made a proper acknowledgment of his irregularity to his immediate superior. Upon this unpleasant occurrence, bishop Keith made the fol-

¹ Willison's Testimony, 94.

² History, ii. 652.

the *primus*, as I always understood the office itself to be designed only temporary, and likewise that he was designed to act nothing therein without the advice and consent of the majority; so I require you, as my proxy, to give vote and suffrage in my name, conform to this my declared sentiments; and particularly that if the bishop of Edinburgh, the present *primus*, shall pretend either to adjourn or dissolve this meeting, contrary to the advice and inclination of the majority of the bishops, or shall any way withdraw his presence from it, or not return to it when called upon and invited by his brethren so to do; that then, and in that case, you shall give suffrage in my name that the bishops may continue to sit and act synodically without him; and I require you [as my proxy] to sit without him accordingly, and to proceed with them to the choice of a new *primus*¹."

MR. LYON having reported that the *primus* and bishop Ochterlonie declined to meet with their brethren, they appointed bishop Rattray and Mr. Lyon to wait on the *primus* that evening, and to invite him the third time to take his place in the synod the following day before noon; at the same time they advertised him, that if he still declined to take his proper place in the synod, they would elect a *primus* in his stead and proceed without him. At ten o'clock on the 13th of July the synod met, and received bishop Rattray and Mr. Lyon's report, that they had waited on bishop Freebairn, and had invited him to this day's meeting, and that "he said, in a very peremptory manner, that he neither would come to it, nor any way countenance their meeting; that they might do as they had a mind, for he would pay no regard to it." After hearing this report, the synod immediately elected bishop Rattray their *primus*, who declared that he accepted the office in the sense and import of the fourth article of the Concordate, as it had been explained in bishop Dunbar's instructions². This brief statement of the preliminary proceedings is given by an unfriendly hand; but another enemy of a different sort says,—"They tried next what harshness would do. In the year 1738, bishops Freebairn and Ochterlonie refusing to concur with the usagers in holding a synodical meeting at Edinburgh, were by them formally *summoned* to take their seats but they refusing to obey the summons, the usagers proceeded without them³." It will be evident, however, to every dispassionate mind, that the synod did not act with that "harshness," or want of courtesy, of which Sievewright accuses them

¹ MS. Memoirs, 69, 70. ² Ibid. 39. ³ Sievewright's Principles, 290, 291.

THE SYNOD declared, "that though they were sensible that bishop Freebairn had rendered himself justly obnoxious to censure, yet, out of a tender regard to his great age and infirmities, they forbore any proceeding against him at this time; and as they had condescended to forbear any proceedings against bishop Freebairn, so also against bishop Ochterlonie, who had in like manner rendered himself justly liable to censure."

THE SYNOD directed their clerk, bishop Keith, to make a register of the consecrations of all the bishops of the Scottish church since the year 1688, "lest the documents of the episcopal succession might perish; and then proposed that some further catechetical instructions than are contained in the liturgy, for the use of such adult persons as come to be confirmed, may be drawn up by the new *primus*, to be laid before the next synod, and then adjourned till next day at four P.M.¹" Perhaps the resolution of this synod was the origin of the 'Historical Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops down to the year 1688,' which was first published in the year 1755; a new edition of which, with a life prefixed, was published in 1824, edited by Dr. Russell, the present bishop of Glasgow.

THE SYNOD met on the 14th of July, and determined that Mr. John Graham, in Souterton, shall belong to the district of Dunblane, as one of the presbyters thereof. The synod was then adjourned till the 17th, at four P.M., when they again met, and appointed bishops Rattray and Keith to draw up a narrative of all that had passed relative to this synodical meeting and preceding the constituting the same, which should be prefixed to the minutes of this synod, and the clerk to have a fair copy written, to be subscribed by all the bishops, and when the synod adjourned till the 28th, at four P.M. On that day bishop Keith produced "a copy of the minutes and narrative prefixed, consisting of one-and-twenty pages, folio: being declared an exact copy, it was subscribed by bishops Rattray, Keith, White, and the proxy, and then the synod was dissolved²."

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met at Edinburgh on the 11th of May; the marquis of Lothian was sent down as royal commissioner. Their first act was designed to heal the breach that had been made by the Secession; but this was in some degree prevented by the haughty conduct and irritating language of the seceders themselves. Both sides were stiff and pertinacious, and there was much more of human passion mixed up

¹ MS. Memoirs.² Ibid. 39, 40.

with the theological dispute than would permit either the one party to yield obedience, or the other to bear with the infirmities of their brethren¹. To use the language of honest Willison:—"Alas! notwithstanding of all these shaking dispensations, the [established] church was not brought to a right sense of her sins and defections, and therefore the Lord's controversy with her was not at an end; for we find the assembly of 1738 continuing in former steps, and giving new offence to many in the church, by another decision in a process of error. . . . These and other proceedings of our assemblies were very grievous to many worthy ministers and others in this church; and the four seceding brethren," with several others, "who afterwards joined them, took occasion, from such actings, to carry their secession and separation to very great heights, by licensing preachers, invading parishes, and preaching up separation everywhere, not sparing their best friends, nor those who dissented from the evils of the time, and took all regular methods to testify against them, but charging the whole ministry with very black things²."

1739.—THE ASSEMBLY of this year met on the 10th of May, and the earl of Hyndford represented the sovereign. All the means that the commission had adopted having failed to reconcile the seceders, the Assembly summoned the brethren individually to appear at their bar. The eight brethren appeared at the bar of the Assembly, not as individuals, but as a lawfully-constituted presbytery. Notwithstanding this extraordinary position, the Assembly intimated to them their readiness to drop the prosecution, and to think no more of by-gones, but to receive them with open arms into full ministerial communion. The seceders, however, had taken their ground, and were not now to be conciliated. The seceding moderator, in name of his presbytery, read an act of their court, in which they condemned the different judicatories of the establishment, as not being lawful courts of Christ, and altogether declined both their authority and jurisdiction. After reading the Act of their Presbytery, they withdrew in a body and paid no more attention to the Assembly³.

BISHOP FREEBAIRN, the *primus*, did not live long after the synod met, but died at the advanced age of eighty-four, at his own house in Leith, on the 24th of December. He is represented as having been a good, well-disposed man, but too easi-

¹ Acts of Assembly, 646, 647.

² Testimony, 97.

³ Acts of Assembly, pp. 649-651.—Willison's Testimony, 97.—Brown's Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Secession, 57, 58.—Gibbs' Display

y the opinions or suggestions of others. Bishop
ie seems to have had considerable influence over
certainly induced him to withhold his presence and
from the late synod, which he had summoned at the
f bishop Rattray. He was opposed to the primitive
nd he allowed himself to be persuaded to coincide
e who wished to suppress that christian liberty in
ich they claimed for themselves. While the debates
bject of the Usages made such a lamentable division
urch, there was no standard, either legal or ecclesias-
which to regulate or enforce an uniformity. Peace
ve been preserved, had not the anti-catholic party,
s then reduced to two bishops, been so intolerant, but
ered each bishop to regulate the affairs of his own
And although some might prefer the Scottish to the
Communion Office, and others the English to the
yet the greatest harmony might have been preserved,
allowed the other to be persuaded in his own mind,
ve acted accordingly.

CHAPTER LXVIII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND THOMAS RATTRAY,
BISHOP OF DUNKELD,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1739.—A meeting of the clergy of Edinburgh—their transactions.—1740.—Another meeting.—Remarks.—1741.—Mr. Falconar elected bishop of Orkney—his consecration.—1742.—Death of bishop Ochterlonie.—Mr. Raitt elected to Brechin—his consecration.—Cambuslang.—Whitfield.—1743.—The diocese of Edinburgh.—Meeting of the clergy.—Death of the primus.—Bishop Rattray's works.

1739.—THE SURVIVING prelates, at the death of bishop Freebairn, were bishops Ochterlonie, Dunbar, Keith, White, and Rattray. No new election of a primus took place, but bishop Rattray succeeded to the primacy in virtue of his election by the late synod. The clergy of Edinburgh met together on the 26th of December, when a sealed paper was produced by one of them, said to have been instructions left by the late primus. It “was offered, opened, and read.” In this document, the rev. William Harper was appointed “guardian of the spiritualities during the vacancy, and conveying to him all the powers which, in our suffering condition, are competent to a dean, and requiring him to convocate the clergy so soon as he shall find it convenient after the bishop's decease, in order to apply to the then primus for a mandate to elect a successor¹.” It was proposed by some of the clergy, that no regard should be paid to the late bishop's nomination, but that they should choose their own chairman. This motion was agreed to, and they elected the same Mr. Harper their president, who immediately took the chair and constituted the meeting by prayer. It was unanimously agreed that a letter should be written immediately to each of the bishops, to notify to them the death of the late primus their diocesan, and to request from them a mandate for the election of a successor as soon as it might suit their convenience².

¹ MS. Memoirs, 41.

² Ibid. 42.

1740.—TO THIS APPLICATION no answer was returned till the beginning of April, when Mr. Harper received a letter to be communicated to his brethren, informing them that the bishops would meet together before they could give a mandate for the election of a bishop of Edinburgh. Mr. Harper again convened his brethren on the 17th of April, when it was resolved to send a second address to each of the bishops. This was done, but no answer was ever returned. “This was thought very surprising; no reason could be given for it, unless the bishops wanted the presbyters of Edinburgh to do as the presbyters of Dunblane had done—that is, to write to the bishops to appoint a bishop for Edinburgh. For on bishop Gillan’s death, the presbytery of Dunblane were desired to apply to the bishops to appoint a bishop for them; which they did. Now began the design to deprive the presbyters of their right of electing their own bishops, that the bishops might have the sole power of filling every vacant diocese or district. When bishop Gadderar died, the presbyters of Aberdeen were too numerous and too wise to be deprived of their right by following the example of the Dunblane clergy, and therefore did elect bishop Dunbar; but when bishop Dunbar was to resign Moray and Ross, he attempted to get the presbyters there to do as the Dunblane clergy had done; that is, to write to the bishops to nominate a bishop for them; but it was not in his power to effect it—the presbyters there would maintain their right of electing. What can be more surprising, three bishops acting so directly contrary to their own principles and practice some few years before? They had suppressed the metropolitan powers, which they once declared essential to order and unity, and now would fain lay the rights of the presbyters as low as they had [once] screwed them high. But the presbyters will not quit their right, and though they of Edinburgh had got no answer to their two addresses, yet they waited, expecting a meeting of the bishops. And even when that happened, no answer or return was given¹.”

NOTWITHSTANDING what the author of the *Memoirs* has said above, it is hardly conceivable that bishop Rattray could have been actuated by the motives which are ascribed to the whole of the bishops; for he resolutely maintained the right of the clergy to elect their bishop. He was also the author of “*An Essay on the Nature of the Church, and a Review of the Election of Bishops in the Primitive Church.*” This work

¹ MS. *Memoirs*, 42, 43.

is “well worthy of the notice of every class of readers, and of those especially who rashly confound the church of Christ with human establishments¹.”

1741.—THE CLERGY of the dioceses of Orkney and Caithness applied to the primus and other bishops to consecrate the rev. William Falconar, presbyter of Forres, to be their bishop and a coadjutor to bishop Keith. These clergy appear to have been treated with greater condescension by the bishops than the Edinburgh clergy had been, and had their request readily granted. The ill-natured Sievewright, however, gives a different turn to this transaction. He says, “Mr. Keith took it into his head to have a coadjutor, or suffragan bishop, under him, to act *as such* in the northern parts. For this office, one Mr. Falconar, minister at Forres, was pitched upon; and in his consecration, bishop Ochterlonie (the only remaining member alive of the old college) was desired to concur with Messrs. Keith and White, as his assistants in the performance of the same, but to no purpose. Bishop Ochterlonie, instead of concurring, protested against these men; so they proceeded to consecrate Mr. Falconar themselves, at Alloa².”

MR. FALCONAR was consecrated at Alloa, on the 10th of September, by bishops Rattray, Keith, and White, as coadjutor to bishop Keith, for the dioceses of Orkney and Caithness. The author of the Memoirs exclaims, “How canonical this consecration was, the reader may satisfy himself by looking into the canons, especially the third, of June 23d, 1727³.” On reference to that canon, it will be seen that this consecration was perfectly canonical, and precisely in conformity with the order laid down in it. There had been some proposals made to consecrate Mr. Gerard at this time, as a coadjutor to bishop Dunbar of Aberdeen; but the clergy of the diocese not being unanimous in their desire to have him for their diocesan, his consecration was deferred.

1742.—BISHOP OCHTERLONIE died at Dundee, in the end of the month of May; and thus was closed the unnatural schism of the college of “bishops at large.” His death also ended the opposition to the primitive usages of the church. He appears to have possessed some property in the county of Forfar; for Wodrow mentions, under date 1711, the “transportation” of a minister from the parish of Forfar, “who, for two years, has had nobody to hear him, because an in-

¹ Keith's Catalogue, App. 438.

² Principles, 291.

³ MS. Memoirs.—Primitive Truth and Order, App. 522.—List, 39.—Keith, App. 550.—Perceval's Apology, 254.—Skinner, ii. 654.—Vide ch. lrv. p. 251-52.

truder, Mr. Ochterlonie, who has an estate in the parish, hinders the people to hear him, and preaches to them. . . . It seems to be feared, likewise, that the parish be rendered for ever inaccessible by the intruder, Mr. Ochterlonie¹." As soon, says Sievewright, "as they got rid of bishop Ochterlonie (. . . .) *these usagers* lost no time in making consecrations to increase the number of their bishops." The primus sent a mandate to the clergy of Brechin, to elect a bishop for that see, now vacant, and their choice fell upon the rev. James Raitt, who officiated to a congregation in Dundee. He was favourable to the catholic rites, which had been so long opposed by his predecessor and others; or, as Sievewright sneeringly remarks, he was a "*bishop of the new cut*"². The author of the Memoirs says, "Yea, they [the bishops] met again, and on the 4th day of October, 1742, did, in the city of Edinburgh, consecrate Mr. James Raitt, elected by the presbyters who had been under the inspection of bishop Ochterlonie, now deceased³." Mr. Raitt was consecrated in Edinburgh on the 4th of October, by the primus bishop Rat-tray, assisted by bishops Keith and White, and appointed to the bishoprick of Brechin. Thus, says Skinner, "we had a church once more regularly organized under six bishops, who, after the primitive mode, had each of them a *portio gregis*—a certain part of the flock under their particular care, and were thereby entitled to a share of the government *in solidum*, in whole, as St. Cyprian describes the standing model in his day; and every presbyter knew his own bishop, whom he was to apply to and obey; which had not been the case during the short reign, or rather *anarchy*, of the *college*"⁴."

"A LEARNED CORRESPONDENT," in the Appendix to Keith's Catalogue, states, "I know nothing more [of bishop Raitt] than that he possessed strong good sense, had a very dignified manner when performing his episcopal offices, and that he was a celebrated preacher,—preaching without notes till he became a very old man. His charges to the youth whom he confirmed, he delivered without notes and without hesitation, long after he was eighty years of age⁵."

THE WHOLE of the northern kingdom was startled from its propriety by an explosion of fanaticism, at a place called Cambuslang, near Glasgow, that has been dignified with the appellation of "an outpouring of the Spirit." In this parish

¹ Wodrow's Correspondence, i. 223, 224.

² Principles, 291.

³ MS. Memoirs 44—*ut supra*.

⁴ Ecclesiastical Hist. ii. 654.

⁵ Keith, App. 544.

“ there were several praying societies, who spent much time in prayers and wrestlings with God, especially in February, 1742, that He might pity them and the whole land, and pour out His Spirit upon them, as on other places. And the [presbyterian] minister having, at their desire, set up a weekly sermon upon Thursday, a little before, and preaching closely to them upon the nature and necessity of regeneration, it pleased the Lord, that upon Thursday, the 18th of February, 1742, the Holy Spirit so wrought upon his hearers that about fifty of them, with many attending them, came into his house, under alarming apprehensions about the state of their souls, crying, ‘ *What shall we do to be saved?*’ The minister being much affected with their case, spent all that day and night with them, either separately or together, in exhortations, instructions, prayers, and singing psalms; being assisted in the work by some preachers and elders. And the awakened and wounded people daily increasing, he was obliged to preach to and converse with them every day, for a great many weeks thereafter; the people filling all the rooms of his house after sermon, and continuing in prayer and singing psalms in different companies, till near midnight. Many ministers came from other places, to Mr. M’Culloch’s assistance, with multitudes of people to hear the word and to be witnesses of that very uncommon work; and there many of them felt the power of the word, and went home with the arrows of God sticking in their hearts; and great numbers of these convinced people attained also to a fair appearance of a hopeful outgate, having their mind filled with peace and joy in believing¹.” This extraordinary excitement spread to other places, and many ministers from distant places came to see the wonderful effects of their diseased imaginations, and to pick up some of the barbed arrows, to fire off in their own parishes.

AMONGST other enthusiasts that went to Cambuslang, was Mr. Whitfield, one of the founders of Methodism, where he “preached many awakening sermons.” The fame of this preacher of Calvinism had reached Scotland, and the new secession presbytery invited him to join their society. He accepted their invitation, and came to Dumfermline, where he preached in Erskine’s meeting-house, in the year 1741. He attended one of their presbytery courts, when they attempted to set him right in the point of church government and the solemn league and covenant. He answered, that settling church government, and preaching about the covenant, was no

¹ Willison’s Testimony, 109, 110.

part of his plan ; but he was told no indulgence could be shewn him, “ for England had *revolted* most with respect to church government.” They indulged him so far as to allow some delay before he signed the covenant, but they insisted that he should preach for them alone, “ *because they were the Lord’s people.*” Whitfield became disgusted with his new friends, and entirely left them, to seek for the Lord’s people in other places. Their junction with him seemed to have proceeded entirely from a selfish motive, that his popularity might fill their meeting-houses and extend their fame. He went to Aberdeen, and preached there ; whence he returned to Edinburgh, and excited so much enthusiasm that he said “ the Holy Spirit seemed to come down like a mighty rushing wind. The mourning of the people was like the weeping in the valley of Hadad-Remmon ¹.” From Edinburgh he hastened to assist at the “ regeneration work ” at Cambuslang, where “ it was attended with *outcrying, trembling, falling down, and fainting*, in many of those who are awakened ².” The secession were jealous of this wonder-working effect of enthusiasm in the establishment, and decried it as much as possible, saying justly that outcries, &c. “ were not symptoms of a work of the Spirit.” No, no, friend Willison, outcries and tremblings, &c. are the mere transitory effects of excitement, and are not the symptoms of that repentance that is not to be repented of. The Holy One of Israel, the Lord of Hosts, has said, “ Take heed and be quiet ; for in returning and rest shall we be saved ; in quietness and confidence shall be our strength ³.” The christian man’s strength is to sit still ; for Christ will gather his children together as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, *if we be obedient.*

1743.—IT APPEARS somewhat unaccountable that the primus and his brethren should have allowed the bishoprick of Edinburgh to remain so long vacant ; unless bishop Rattray had resolved that, as *primus*, he himself was virtually the diocesan of that see. This is the more probable, inasmuch as hitherto the bishops of Edinburgh had been considered metropolitans. The diocese of Edinburgh remained three years vacant, although the greatest number of clergy were constantly resident and officiating within it. Indeed, the author of the Memoirs says, it “ was quite neglected by the bishops.” The Edinburgh clergy were much dissatisfied at this apparent neglect, and after holding frequent meetings, with the view

¹ Southey’s Life of Wesley, ii. 226.

² Willison, 112.

³ Isaiah, vii. 4.—xxx. 7-15.

which we might recover that happiness originally intended for us."

HIS OTHER printed works are—"A Question, concerning such as have Communicated in the Eucharist without being previously confirmed by the bishop, fully answered upon the principles of the primitive Catholic Church;" with a postscript.—An Essay on the Nature of Man, as he is a creature endowed with reason, and thereby capable of religion; with a postscript.—An Essay on the Nature of the Church, and a review of the Election of Bishops in the Primitive Church; together with some annexed Dissertations, published during his life in 1728. He also left many manuscripts, letters, sermons, and dissertations, which it is to be hoped will be published by the Spottiswood Society, to realize the words of Scripture,—having cast his bread upon the waters, after many days of oblivion we may find it.

**TO NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY**

**ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS**



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

CHAPTER LXIX.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND ROBERT KEITH,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,
AND
PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1743.—Bishop Keith resigns Fife.—Consecration of bishop Alexander—Anecdote of him.—The benefit of catechising.—An episcopal synod—bishop Keith elected *primus*—canons adopted—farther transactions.—Bishop Raitt complains of a Mr. Fyfe—other transactions.—Letter on the Scottish communion-office—1744.—A meeting of the Edinburgh clergy—their transactions—discontent—their letter to the *primus*—their commentary on the canons.—Bishop Smith—letter from bishop Keith to him—remonstrating with him.—A declaration by the *primus*—in favour of the liturgy—stating full communion with the church of England.—Election of Mr. Oglevie.—Meeting of the Edinburgh clergy—their letter to the *primus*.—Smith's intrigues.—A declaration by the clergy of Dunkeld against Smith.—Another meeting of the Edinburgh clergy—Mr. M'Kenzie's speech—their address—their five articles.—1745.—Bishop Keith's reply to the Edinburgh address.—Remarks.

1748.—THE SYNOD that was appointed by the late *primus* to be held in the first week in June does not appear to have assembled, probably on account of bishop Rattray's unexpected and lamented death. Bishop Keith resigned the superintendence of the district of Fife, part of the ancient diocese of St. Andrews, and it was supposed that the clergy of Edinburgh intended to have elected him as their bishop. In a letter to Mr. Auchinleck, however, bishop Keith formally declared that he never solicited the clergy in any shape to elect him, but on the contrary had declined the appointment when it was actually offered to him¹.

THE CLERGY of the vacant diocese of Dunkeld obtained a mandate, and elected Mr. John Alexander, priest at Alloa, "a person of apostolical simplicity, piety, and benevolence." In order to consecrate the elect of Dunkeld, bishops White, Falconar, and Raitt, came to Edinburgh, and on the 19th of

¹ Life of Bishop Keith, prefixed to his Catalogue, xxx.

August Mr. Alexander was consecrated by bishop Keith, assisted by the three above-named prelates¹.

BISHOP ALEXANDER was held in the highest estimation whilst he lived; and his reputation and memory still live in the church of Scotland. The late much-esteemed *primus* of that church, Dr. Walker, relates a circumstance that connects the present time with that apostolical man. "Many years ago," he says, "I heard the late venerable Dr. Gaskin relate the following fact:—'When I first came to this parish (Stoke Newington), I remarked a plain man, who was never absent from church, who communicated regularly every month, and conducted himself with great appearance of devotion. I was, in consequence, desirous of becoming acquainted with him. He was a gardener from Scotland. He was so perfectly acquainted with every thing connected with our communion, so well instructed in every principle, and so rationally pious, as excited my extreme surprise when he told me he came from Scotland, a presbyterian country: for of the episcopal church there I was almost entirely ignorant. I expressed my surprise, when he replied, with a strong expression of feeling—*Ah, sir, I was well catechised in all that, by bishop ALEXANDER at Alloa*².'" The foregoing anecdote is produced by bishop Walker to shew the inestimable benefit of catechising the young members of the flock. He also mentions the benefit arising from the early catechising of the late bishop Skinner of Aberdeen, which was the happy means of conveying instruction to the christianised heathens of the far west. He says—"Another young American mentioned that he was actually minister of a congregation, which came into the church in a similar way [*i. e.* in a body, people, minister, and all], and of course he had considerable labour in instructing them in our peculiarities, in which he stated that he was aided in the most efficient manner by a lay parishioner from Scotland, who had been regularly *catechised*, as he said, by the *late bishop* [John] SKINNER, of Aberdeen³."

ALL THE BISHOPS of this reduced church, except bishop Dunbar, being now assembled in Edinburgh, it was agreed, at the written suggestion of the bishop of Aberdeen, to embrace this opportunity to hold an episcopal synod. It met, accordingly, the day after bishop Alexander's consecration, on the 20th of August. There were present, the bishops

¹ MS. Memoirs, 45.—Keith's Catalogue, Appendix, 539.—Skinner, ii. 654.—List, &c., 39.—Primitive Truth and Order, App. 522.—Perceval's Apology, 254.

² Bishop Walker's Charge to the Clergy of Edinburgh and Glasgow, 1833, Note E, p. 47.

³ Ibid. Note D, p. 46.

Keith, White, Falconar, Raitt, and Alexander; but, from old age and bodily infirmities, bishop Dunbar, of Aberdeen, was unable to attend. Their first transaction was to elect bishop Keith to be their *primus*, and the new bishop of Dunkeld their clerk. The bishop of Aberdeen transmitted his sentiments by letter to his brethren, and his letter was inserted in the minutes, in which, among other things, he says—"their late *primus* had some canons to propose for establishment, which were most worthy of their regard. I know not if it will be convenient at this time to enjoin the use of the Scots communion-office, though it ought to be recommended. One more primitive and excellent, which cost Dr. Rattray much labour, and which he has left in a fair manuscript, may one day be published, and received with universal approbation¹." The synod resolved to establish these canons for the regulation of the affairs of the church; of which the late *primus* had left a draught that he had intended to have proposed, had the synod met in June; they were, therefore, submitted to the consideration of the meeting. "The first ten whereof, they say, were drawn up by bishop Rattray, one by bishop Dunbar, three by bishop Falconar, and two by bishop White; in all sixteen were agreed to, and, as they say, established²." These, "being the last of the kind, and consequently the standing regulations of the discipline of our church," Mr. Skinner has set down from the original minutes, as follows:—

THE PREAMBLE.—The bishops of this church of Scotland being now, by the good providence of God, perfectly united in one and the same mind, and the concordates that were formed while some unhappy differences subsisted amongst them thereby vacated, they have unanimously agreed to establish the following canons for the future regulation of the government of this church:—

I. THAT NO PERSON shall be consecrated a bishop without the consent and approbation of the majority of the bishops, and that if any three or more bishops, not being a majority, shall take upon them, without such consent, to consecrate any person to that office, such consecration shall be null and void, and both the consecrators and the consecrated shall be holden as schismatics.

II. THAT THE BISHOPS shall, without respect either to seniority of consecration or precedency of district, choose a *primus* by majority of voices, who shall have no other privilege among the bishops but of convoking and presiding only,

¹ Sievwright's Principles, p. 292.

² MS. Memoirs, 45.

and that, likewise, under the following restrictions:—That he shall always be obliged to notify to the other bishops the reasons of his calling a meeting, as well as the time and place; and if the majority shall dissent, as judging either the reasons insufficient or the time and place improper, that meeting shall be either wholly set aside, or the time and place altered, as shall seem to them most expedient. 2. That if the primus shall at any time refuse to call a meeting when desired by a majority of the other bishops, they shall in that case have power to meet and act synodically without him; and, 3dly, the primus, thus chosen by the majority, is to continue in that office only during their pleasure.

III. THAT IF EITHER the present or any subsequent primus shall, in the present situation of the church, lay claim to any metropolitical or vicarial power, or to any farther power of any kind than what is granted to the primus by these present canons, the primus or bishop so claiming shall be suspended from all episcopal jurisdiction, even within his own district, until he give in to the bishops a subscribed renunciation of any such claim, as being what may prove of most dangerous consequence to the church in her present circumstances.

IV. THAT UPON the demise or translation of any bishop, the presbyters of the district thereby become vacant shall not be at freedom either to elect or submit themselves to any other bishop, without a mandate from the primus with the majority of the bishops; but if the primus shall refuse to grant a mandate, the majority shall do it without him.

V. THAT IF THE presbyters of any district shall happen to elect a person already vested with the episcopal character, the bishop so elected shall have no jurisdiction over that district until his election be confirmed by the majority of the bishops; and if they shall elect a presbyter of whose fitness for that office the bishops shall declare they have sufficient reasons not to be satisfied, in that case the presbyters shall be required by the bishops to proceed to a new election.

VI. THAT EVERY BISHOP shall appoint one of his presbyters to officiate under him as his dean, and that this dean shall be obliged to advertise the primus upon the death of his bishop, that the bishops may provide for the supply of the vacancy with their conveniency; and the dean shall apply for a mandate to elect a successor, in the space of four months at farthest after the vacancy.

VII. THAT DURING the vacancy of any district, the presbyters thereof shall apply to the bishop who shall have his place of residence nearest to them, for the performance of

bishopal offices amongst them ; and no other bishop shall take upon him to perform any such offices within that district without the consent of the neighbouring bishop. And if any case relating to discipline shall happen, for which the presbyters had no rule left them by their former bishop for their direction, they shall have recourse to the primus, who, with the advice and consent of his colleagues, shall determine the same.

VIII. THAT NO PRESBYTER shall take upon him the charge of any congregation, until he be appointed thereto by the bishop of whose district that congregation belongs ; nor shall any presbyter or deacon remove from his own district without disjunctory letters from the bishop thereof ; and none shall be ordained a presbyter without a designation to a particular charge.

IX. THAT SEEING, in the present distressed state of this church, it may happen that a bishop may have his dwelling and place for public worship within the district of another bishop ; in that case, those who belong to this his congregation, together with the presbyters or deacons joined with him and his assistants in officiating therein, shall be as much under his jurisdiction as if they were within the bounds of his own district, and shall be exempt from the jurisdiction of that bishop within the bounds of whose district they are ; and the bishop in whose district they are, shall, by a subscribed deed, assent to this regulation.

X. THAT EVERY BISHOP shall be careful to recommend to his clergy, and to such also as may be candidates for holy orders, to apply themselves diligently to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and of the fathers of the apostolical and two next succeeding ages, and to take all proper opportunities in their sermons and otherwise to instruct their people in the truly catholic principles of that pure and primitive church.

XI. THE DEAN of every district, as representing the presbytery, shall be allowed to sit in all synodical meetings, to propose and reason in all matters of discipline and grievances of presbyters, but not to give any decisive voice. The clergy of vacant districts shall be required to choose a dean out of their own number ; and the said dean, so chosen, shall not be allowed to name a proxy, but must attend in person, and bring with him his credentials.

XII. THAT THE CHURCH may suffer as little damage as possible by the death of the temporary primus, the senior bishop shall instantly succeed to his powers until the next synod ; and he shall be obliged to call a synod, so as it may be holden

within the space of four months at farthest after the death of the former primus, unless the majority of the bishops shall think fit to delay it for a longer space.

XIII. THAT WHEN any of the bishops are disabled from being personally present at a synod, through infirmity or pressing inconvenience to be notified to the primus, and by him to the other bishops, the absent bishop or bishops may send their judgment to the primus, signed with their own hand, concerning those matters on account of which the synod was precisely called to meet, and this shall be holden for their canonical vote. The absent bishops may likewise propose to the synod, in writing, any thing they shall judge expedient for the good of the church; and as to other matters that may incidentally come before the synod, the absent bishop or bishops must be concluded by the majority of those that are present. But no synod shall be holden unless there be more bishops present than absent.

XIV. THAT IN ALL questions or cases where the bishops shall happen to be equally divided in their opinions, in synod or out of synod, that side of the question shall carry upon which the primus gives his vote.

XV. THAT IF ANY presbyter or deacon who shall have the misfortune to be deposed by his bishop, do presume to perform any part of the sacred office, or to gather a separate or schismatical congregation, he shall be excommunicated. And if any clergyman shall take upon him to countenance such presbyter or deacon in their schismatical separation, he shall be suspended from the exercise of his holy function for such space as his bishop shall think fit; and such of the laity as shall venture to adhere to the deposed presbyter or deacon, either in worship or other sacred administration, shall not be allowed to partake of any church ordinances until they are reconciled again, and received by the bishop of the district.

XVI. THAT IF ANY clergyman shall take upon himself to join persons in matrimony who belong to the congregation of another clergyman, without a certificate or recommendation from their former pastor, he shall, for the first fault, be suspended from his office for the space of three months; six months for the second fault; and for the third fault he shall be suspended *sine die*¹.

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs is very dissatisfied with this

¹ Cited from the Original Minutes. by Mr. Skinner.—*Ecclesiastical History*, ii. 655-660.

synod, and only cites the ninth of bishop Rattray's articles, "as a specimen of these canons ;" and he insinuates that it was prepared for the express purpose of exempting bishop Keith from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Edinburgh; and then he adds, "*ex ungue leonem !*"¹ He also says, that "the bishops in synod then agree that the several bishops do recommend to their clergy, in the strongest manner, the use of the Scottish liturgy in the administration of the holy communion. —*Item*, That they administer the sacrament of baptism, and solemnise the institution of matrimony, according to the forms in the liturgy. —*Item*, That they take pains to persuade their people to get their banns of matrimony publicly promulgated. —*Item*, That they admit no persons to the holy communion before they are confirmed by a bishop, or shew a desire to do so where it cannot be had²."

THE SYNOD again met on the 22d of August. Bishop Raitt preferred a complaint against the rev. David Fyfe, a priest in the diocese of Dunkeld, for an intrusion on his episcopal authority. There had been some difficulty about the appointment of an incumbent to the chapel which had been possessed by the late bishop Ochterlonie; for the congregation had resolved not to appoint Mr. Robertson, the late bishop's curate, because he favoured the primitive usages. They called this Mr. Fyfe, whom bishop Raitt refused to induct, and even prohibited his preaching in that chapel; but Fyfe took possession of the pulpit some time before the commencement of the service, and officiated in defiance of the bishop's prohibition. The synod agreed to pronounce a sentence of deposition against Fyfe, if the accusation should be proved by witnesses; and bishops White, Falconar, and Alexander, were appointed to try Mr. Fyfe at any place which bishop Raitt might appoint within his own diocese. The synod then authorised and requested the primus to write to the senior priest of the diocese of Edinburgh, to direct him to convoke all the clergy of the district, in order to their choosing a dean; and afterwards officially to inform the primus on whom the choice had fallen. This dean was to be a mere cypher, to sit and hear the bishops talk and do what they pleased; he was to have no vote. In this synod not the least notice was taken of the deplorable state in which the diocese of Edinburgh was, for want of a bishop; and no mandate was ever offered to the presbyters to elect one. In the beginning of this synod, bishop Keith was elected primus; on the last Tuesday of the synod,

¹ MS. Memoirs, 46, 47.² Ibid. 46.

they
then
Mor
Crud
to be
was
and
of Ju
of Ju
(bish
the
Crud
there
secrete
elect
conso
of his
episc
the po
number
by wh
of that
in cap
think fit

Lock
mined
herself
long a
appear
they sh
of the co
wherea
warhel

they complained of as tending to mere cypher, and involving the affairs of the church into the obedience to bishop Keith's. Mr. Auchinleck convened a synod on the 17th of January, to consider the contents of the bishop's letter. Mr. Auchinleck was the chairman, who, after constituting the synod, said, "By the constitution of the church [alone] could not hold a synod, and could not make canons without the consent of the people, who made an essential part of the church. It was an act of parliament, and not of the parliament of Charles II. It advanced many other things, which were not in the church." "Then the presbytery of this church hold a synod of the presbyters?" To which he answered, '*they cannot.*' It should be presented, respecting the privileges of the church, and make canons without the consent of the people. This grievance, and that in the church, accordingly, an address was drawn up by the presbyters, and ordered to be sent to each bishop, which was ever received from any

of the 17th of January, is called, "Disputes of the Episcopal Faculty of Advocates; and a copy of Mr. Lawson's praise-ment of it. After acknowledging the bishop's letter, and repeating its

double your reverences with respect than they concern ourselves, in our choice, but that the necessity would make our silence sinful; and ourselves obliged to comfort whom, by principle and in-

the primus offers to resign his title to the *portio gregis* he had as bishop to the church of Fife ; which resignation the bishops accepted, so that bishop Keith was no longer primus, according to the second canon of peace, 1727¹."

NOTWITHSTANDING the opposition that the college of bishops, and the anti-catholic party attached to them, had made to the primitive rites in the communion office, yet the catholic doctrines made great progress among the clergy in the northern parts of the kingdom. Mr. Cheyne cites part of a letter from the rev. Robert Lyon, of Perth, who suffered an ignominious death at Carlisle, to bishop Alexander, dated November 28th, shewing the liturgical practice of the church generally, so far, at least, as relates to the Eucharistic service:—"The majority," says Mr. Lyon, "who use the Scotch liturgy, is so great that they are now but very few who do otherwise ; and these few in the southern parts mostly, overawed by some ignorant laity. All in this district [diocese of Dunkeld] are unanimous in the Scotch, save myself ; who, not of inclination, but for reasons too well known, was obliged to comply with borrowing only the invocation and oblation from the Scotch. All in bishop Raitt's district [Brechin] use the Scotch communion office likewise, except two ; but whether these two transpose the oblatory prayer or not, I cannot tell ; but sure I am, bishop Ochterlonie² himself did so. I am likewise sure that the greatest part of the presbyters in Fife, if not all, do use the Scotch and, besides, the most of all these clergy use it in its natural order, according to the edition printed at Aberdeen. It is also well known, and without doubt to yourself, that there is not one single presbyter benorth the Mearns who does not officiate by the Scotch ; so that those who use the English, or who transpose the oblatory prayer, though joined together, are few, yea, very few, upon the comparison. And I am persuaded the most of the clergy of my acquaintance, and with great sincerity I can say it of myself, would much sooner *resign* our several charges *than give up* the Scotch to use the English communion office ; yea, the greatest number even of our laity would desert us should we attempt it."

1744.—THE CLERGY of the district of Edinburgh were dissatisfied with the bishops for holding a synod and enacting canons without having admitted the second order of the hie-

¹ MS. Memoirs, 47, 48.

² Mr. Cheyne's Vindication, p. 30.—"Bishop Ochterlonie was a resolute opponent of the so-called Usages, and the last of the college party, or bishops at large ; and yet he seems to have done himself what he opposed in a general measure."

archy into their councils. This they complained of as tending to reduce the order of priests to a mere cypher, and involving the whole management of the affairs of the church into the hands of the episcopal order. In obedience to bishop Keith's letter, dated November 5th, 1743, Mr. Auchinleck convened the clergy of the district of Edinburgh on the 17th of January, and communicated to them the contents of the bishop's letter. The clergy elected Mr. Auchinleck chairman, who, after constituting the meeting by prayer, said, "By the constitution of the church in Scotland, the bishops [alone] could not hold a synod, and consequently they could not make canons without the concurrence of the presbyters, who made an essential part of its constitution. And he produced an act of parliament made in the third session of the first parliament of Charles II. in support of what he said, and advanced many other things as to the constitution of the church." "Then the presbyters stated a vote,—'Can the bishops of this church hold a synod and make canons without the consent of the presbyters?' To which each presbyter, except one, answered, '*they cannot.*' It was then resolved that an address should be presented, representing the encroachments made on the privileges of the presbyters, in offering to hold a synod and make canons without them, and entreating redress of this grievance, and that in as dutiful a manner as possible. Accordingly, an address was written and subscribed by eighteen presbyters, and ordered to be put in the register, and a copy to be sent to each bishop, which was done. But no return was ever received from any one of the bishops¹."

THE LETTER above mentioned, of the 17th of January, is preserved in a MS. volume, entitled, "Disputes of the Episcopalians," in the library of the Faculty of Advocates; and I gladly and thankfully avail myself of Mr. Lawson's praiseworthy industry, to give an abridgment of it. After acknowledging the receipt of the primus's letter, and repeating its contents, they continue:—

"WE SHALL not at present trouble your reverences with remarks upon your canons any further than they concern ourselves, and even that would not have been our choice, but that the necessity you have put us under would make our silence sinful; for it is with grief of heart we find ourselves obliged to complain of the proceedings of those whom, by principle and in-

¹ MS. Memoirs 48, 49.

clination, we are much disposed to love and obey. But while we honour your sacred office, and do not at all envy you the dignity to which you have attained, we cannot be quite unconcerned for the rights of our own lower order, when we see designs forming to invade those rights, or to threaten them with danger. This concern we humbly conceive cannot be displeasing to your reverences, if it is considered only as an imitation of that zeal to preserve those rights which some of your venerable numbers shewed when ye were with us; nor can we think it less incumbent upon us to watch over this sacred depositum, that we have now, by what means we shall not say, been long kept in a state of orphanage, without the guidance and protection of a proper head. . . . As we humbly apprehend, the constitution of a christian church is a thing so sacred and so determined, that it cannot be new modelled or altered in essentials, upon every revisal made of it by any one of its constituent parts; so it is no more competent to your high order to abolish the presbyterate than it is in our power to renounce or withhold that canonical obedience we owe to our bishops; so it appears to us (. . . .) that by the constitution of the episcopal church of Scotland, the presbyters did sit in synods and church assemblies with their bishops, not barely to hear and propose, but to reason and represent, that they had authoritative voices, and voted decisively in whatsoever question came before them; that not only the deans and other dignitaries of each diocese came to those assemblies in their own right, but the rural clergy were duly represented there by some of their own number, chosen by themselves and sent thither on that purpose, whose votes were numbered with the rest; and, in short, that the powers of legislation and discipline were not then thought to have been lodged in the bishops alone, without the advice and concurrence of their clergy.

“ AS THIS PRIVILEGE of the second order has been long struggled for in other churches, even where papal encroachments went high, and as it is still preserved by our sister church of England, where nothing can have the force of a canon, or regularly pass into ecclesiastical law, without the consent of presbyters, and where each house of convocation has a negative upon the other, so we humbly think it would be rather superfluous than difficult to shew that all this is copied from the primitive pattern, and is well consistent with the Holy Scriptures, and with the constitution and practice of the church of Christ in her purest and best ages. . . . The

constitution of our church thus appearing to us to be regular and right, and well founded, we humbly conceive that we are obliged in conscience, in virtue of the duty we owe to God and His church, to your reverences, to ourselves, and to all those who may succeed in the second order, earnestly to beg you would stop all further innovation of any sort, and particularly all encroachments upon the rights and privileges of our second order; or whatever may tend to subverting that good and wholesome constitution. . . . This being our constitution, and considering that you have proceeded single and alone to hold a synod, wherein you have made or ratified several canons, and treated and concluded in matters of legislation and discipline relating to the whole church, notwithstanding the presbyters of Scotland were not represented there, nor were called to take that place which belongs to them in synods and assemblies of the church;—this being the hard case, we do earnestly beg your reverences will consider seriously what must be the fatal consequence; whether laws and constitutions can be submitted to where the legislation was incomplete, or, if they should be submitted to, whether the constitution of the church would not thereby receive a deep wound.

“ YOUR NINTH canon seems chiefly intended for serving a particular purpose in the city of Edinburgh, where, if it should take effect, our bishop, when God shall bless us with one, would be robbed of a part of his flock and a considerable number of his clergy, and all the refugees from his discipline would take shelter under the patronage of the exempt bishop; as on all these accounts we find it incumbent upon us, in our present circumstances, to guard against it, so we humbly conceive it is directly repugnant to the plan of primitive episcopacy, to the polity and canons of the ancient church; which, instead of encouraging a bishop to have his place of residence and public worship within the diocese of another, forbade and condemned non-residence, declared there should be but one bishop in one city, and piously believed that as there is but one God, one Christ the Lord, and one Holy Ghost, so there ought to be but one bishop in a catholic church. We were assured some years ago, that the presbyters of a vacant diocese had inherent rights and privileges—that it belonged to them to elect their own bishop—that they might of themselves meet for that purpose, as well as any other—and that a mandate from the metropolitan or bishop of the province was not necessary, unless the presbyters proved backward in the matter; but now, by the third

canon, we are told the contrary. . . . The circumstances of our church are much the same as they were about seventeen years ago, when you declared, in like solemn manner, that no good order or unity could be maintained in the church without a metropolitan. We would have taken no notice of this your third canon, were it not intended to give a secret blow to the rights and privileges of the see of Edinburgh, whereof we humbly think ourselves guardians during the vacancy.

“ BY YOUR fourth, fifth, and seventh canons . . . and the ones referred to in the beginning of this paper, we humbly conceive the rights of our order are stripped to a shadow, and our privileges greatly shortened of what your reverences thought once they should be. We might then meet and elect a bishop without waiting for leave from the metropolitan, but now we must not without a mandate from your temporary primus. The semblance of power still left us to choose a bishop, is made void and elusory, while your reverences have reserved for yourselves a faculty of rejecting our elect without giving us a reason, only telling us you have reasons that satisfy yourselves ; and thus we must be sent to elect over and over again till we come to the happy favourite who may be most acceptable to your reverences, though perhaps least fit for us and the purposes of his high calling. . . . To complete this new scheme of ecclesiastical polity, our second order, which in former times had a right to sit and vote in assemblies of the church, not only by deans and other dignified persons, but by the proctors of the inferior clergy, in proportion to their numbers and the extent of each diocese, is henceforth to be represented in your future synods by one *cypher*, a mere titular dean, who may hear and speak, but is by no means to be allowed the privilege of voting We hope your reverence will not think us presbyterians for affirming the just rights of the second order. Some of the greatest men our island has produced were of the same sentiments, and the best of our kings, who died a martyr for the church, came to find, too late that a moderate episcopacy was the best.

“ WE SOLEMNLY DECLARE before God and the world, that we have no intention nor desire to restrain the just powers, or to invade the due privileges of your sacred order, as we dare not surrender those of our own ; being sensible that encroachments from either side would be equally fatal to the church, as equally endangering her constitution. . . . As this humble address and memorial is well meant, we hope your reverences will take it in good part. It is still in your power to restore peace

and honour to this distressed church, by agreeing to let her polity stand upon the old true foundation¹." It is signed by Thomas Auchinleck, the moderator, and by eighteen priests.

THE DISCONTENT of the clergy of Edinburgh was now so great that they unhappily had entered into correspondence with Mr. George Smith, one of the non-juring bishops in England that had been consecrated, in 1728, by the party that separated from the original non-juring succession, about the matter of the Usages². The schism occasioned by the "bishops at large" had died out in the person of bishop Ochterlonie; but the schismatical spirit, it would appear, had still remained in many of the clergy. This was increased by the unbending exclusiveness of the bishops, who seemed to have answered none of their letters or addresses, contrary to that courtesy which the Apostle recommends, and the transaction of business requires. Bishop Smith took advantage of the deposition of Mr. Fyfe to make himself a "busy-body;" and he wrote to bishop Keith, requesting him to restore Fyfe; which being declined, bishop Smith took him into communion with himself. This occasioned some unpleasant correspondence, and a threat from bishop Smith of creating a formal schism in the Scottish church, by the consecration of one of the Edinburgh clergy a bishop, in opposition to the indigenous prelates. This most unnatural and schismatical conduct on the part of bishop Smith produced the following letter from the primus, dated May 22d:—

"RIGHT REVEREND BROTHER,—At your desire I saw the letter of April 2d, which you sent to the Rev. Mr. John M'Kenzie of this city. I thank you for the favour, although I cannot but acknowledge the contents did surprise me not a little. The suppositions you are pleased to form to yourself, and the things which you say that you see in our late minutes, my most inward conscience knows to be altogether groundless. I am sorry to find you forming a resolution to set forward an illicit consecration in this country, and thereby to raise a most horrid schism in this free and independent church, for no cause whatsoever that any indifferent persons, even in your own country, will be able, I dare presume, to discern. I can assure you there is neither any alteration intended here in the public worship, nor is there any complaint in all this kingdom

¹ Cited from the MS. in Lawson's History of the Scottish Episcopal Church, from the Revolution to the present Time, pp. 270-276.

² Vide Perceval's Apology, 248.

and that, likewise, under the following restrictions:—That he shall always be obliged to notify to the other bishops the reasons of his calling a meeting, as well as the time and place; and if the majority shall dissent, as judging either the reasons insufficient or the time and place improper, that meeting shall be either wholly set aside, or the time and place altered, as shall seem to them most expedient. 2. That if the primus shall at any time refuse to call a meeting when desired by a majority of the other bishops, they shall in that case have power to meet and act synodically without him; and, 3dly, the primus, thus chosen by the majority, is to continue in that office only during their pleasure.

III. THAT IF EITHER the present or any subsequent primus shall, in the present situation of the church, lay claim to any metropolitical or vicarial power, or to any farther power of any kind than what is granted to the primus by these present canons, the primus or bishop so claiming shall be suspended from all episcopal jurisdiction, even within his own district, until he give in to the bishops a subscribed renunciation of any such claim, as being what may prove of most dangerous consequence to the church in her present circumstances.

IV. THAT UPON the demise or translation of any bishop, the presbyters of the district thereby become vacant shall not be at freedom either to elect or submit themselves to any other bishop, without a mandate from the primus with the majority of the bishops; but if the primus shall refuse to grant a mandate, the majority shall do it without him.

V. THAT IF THE presbyters of any district shall happen to elect a person already vested with the episcopal character, the bishop so elected shall have no jurisdiction over that district until his election be confirmed by the majority of the bishops; and if they shall elect a presbyter of whose fitness for that office the bishops shall declare they have sufficient reasons not to be satisfied, in that case the presbyters shall be required by the bishops to proceed to a new election.

VI. THAT EVERY BISHOP shall appoint one of his presbyters to officiate under him as his dean, and that this dean shall be obliged to advertise the primus upon the death of his bishop, that the bishops may provide for the supply of the vacancy with their conveniency; and the dean shall apply for a mandate to elect a successor, in the space of four months at farthest after the vacancy.

VII. THAT DURING the vacancy of any district, the presbyters thereof shall apply to the bishop who shall have his place of residence nearest to them, for the performance of

bishopal offices amongst them ; and no other bishop shall take upon him to perform any such offices within that district without the consent of the neighbouring bishop. And if any case relating to discipline shall happen, for which the presbyters had no rule left them by their former bishop for their direction, they shall have recourse to the primus, who, with the advice and consent of his colleagues, shall determine the same.

VIII. THAT NO PRESBYTER shall take upon him the charge of any congregation, until he be appointed thereto by the bishop whose district that congregation belongs ; nor shall any presbyter or deacon remove from his own district without dissolatory letters from the bishop thereof ; and none shall be ordained a presbyter without a designation to a particular charge.

IX. THAT SEEING, in the present distressed state of this church, it may happen that a bishop may have his dwelling and place for public worship within the district of another bishop ; in that case, those who belong to this his congregation, together with the presbyters or deacons joined with him and his assistants in officiating therein, shall be as much under his jurisdiction as if they were within the bounds of his own district, and shall be exempt from the jurisdiction of that bishop within the bounds of whose district they are ; and the bishop in whose district they are, shall, by a subscribed deed, assent to this regulation.

X. THAT EVERY BISHOP shall be careful to recommend to his clergy, and to such also as may be candidates for holy orders, to apply themselves diligently to the study of the Holy scriptures, and of the fathers of the apostolical and two next succeeding ages, and to take all proper opportunities in their sermons and otherwise to instruct their people in the truly catholic principles of that pure and primitive church.

XI. THE DEAN of every district, as representing the presbytery, shall be allowed to sit in all synodical meetings, to propose and reason in all matters of discipline and grievances of presbyters, but not to give any decisive voice. The clergy of vacant districts shall be required to choose a dean out of their own number ; and the said dean, so chosen, shall not be allowed to name a proxy, but must attend in person, and bring with him his credentials.

XII. THAT THE CHURCH may suffer as little damage as possible by the death of the temporary primus, the senior bishop shall instantly succeed to his powers until the next synod ; and he shall be obliged to call a synod, so as it may be holden

within the space of four months at farthest after the death of the former primus, unless the majority of the bishops shall think fit to delay it for a longer space.

XIII. THAT WHEN any of the bishops are disabled from being personally present at a synod, through infirmity or pressing inconvenience to be notified to the primus, and by him to the other bishops, the absent bishop or bishops may send their judgment to the primus, signed with their own hand, concerning those matters on account of which the synod was precisely called to meet, and this shall be holden for their canonical vote. The absent bishops may likewise propose to the synod, in writing, any thing they shall judge expedient for the good of the church; and as to other matters that may incidentally come before the synod, the absent bishop or bishops must be concluded by the majority of those that are present. But no synod shall be holden unless there be more bishops present than absent.

XIV. THAT IN ALL questions or cases where the bishops shall happen to be equally divided in their opinions, in synod or out of synod, that side of the question shall carry upon which the primus gives his vote.

XV. THAT IF ANY presbyter or deacon who shall have the misfortune to be deposed by his bishop, do presume to perform any part of the sacred office, or to gather a separate or schismatical congregation, he shall be excommunicated. And if any clergyman shall take upon him to countenance such presbyter or deacon in their schismatical separation, he shall be suspended from the exercise of his holy function for such space as his bishop shall think fit; and such of the laity as shall venture to adhere to the deposed presbyter or deacon, either in worship or other sacred administration, shall not be allowed to partake of any church ordinances until they are reconciled again, and received by the bishop of the district.

XVI. THAT IF ANY clergyman shall take upon himself to join persons in matrimony who belong to the congregation of another clergyman, without a certificate or recommendation from their former pastor, he shall, for the first fault, be suspended from his office for the space of three months; six months for the second fault; and for the third fault he shall be suspended *sine die*¹.

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs is very dissatisfied with this

¹ Cited from the Original Minutes, by Mr. Skinner.—*Eccelesiastical History*, ii. 655-660.

synod, and only cites the ninth of bishop Rattray's articles, "as a specimen of these canons ;" and he insinuates that it was prepared for the express purpose of exempting bishop Keith from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Edinburgh; and then he adds, "*ex ungue leonem !*"¹ He also says, that "the bishops in synod then agree that the several bishops do recommend to their clergy, in the strongest manner, the use of the Scottish liturgy in the administration of the holy communion. —*Item*, That they administer the sacrament of baptism, and solemnise the institution of matrimony, according to the forms in the liturgy. —*Item*, That they take pains to persuade their people to get their banns of matrimony publicly promulgated. —*Item*, That they admit no persons to the holy communion before they are confirmed by a bishop, or shew a desire to do so where it cannot be had²."

THE SYNOD again met on the 22d of August. Bishop Raitt preferred a complaint against the rev. David Fyfe, a priest in the diocese of Dunkeld, for an intrusion on his episcopal authority. There had been some difficulty about the appointment of an incumbent to the chapel which had been possessed by the late bishop Ochterlonie; for the congregation had resolved not to appoint Mr. Robertson, the late bishop's curate, because he favoured the primitive usages. They called this Mr. Fyfe, whom bishop Raitt refused to induct, and even prohibited his preaching in that chapel; but Fyfe took possession of the pulpit some time before the commencement of the service, and officiated in defiance of the bishop's prohibition. The synod agreed to pronounce a sentence of deposition against Fyfe, if the accusation should be proved by witnesses; and bishops White, Falconar, and Alexander, were appointed to try Mr. Fyfe at any place which bishop Raitt might appoint within his own diocese. The synod then authorised and requested the primus to write to the senior priest of the diocese of Edinburgh, to direct him to convoke all the clergy of the district, in order to their choosing a dean; and afterwards officially to inform the primus on whom the choice had fallen. 'This dean was to be a mere cypher, to sit and hear the bishops talk and do what they pleased; he was to have no vote. In this synod not the least notice was taken of the deplorable state in which the diocese of Edinburgh was, for want of a bishop; and no mandate was ever offered to the presbyters to elect one. In the beginning of this synod, bishop Keith was elected primus; on the last Tuesday of the synod,

¹ MS. Memoirs, 46, 47.² Ibid. 46.

the primus offers to resign his title to the *portio gregis* he had as bishop to the church of Fife ; which resignation the bishops accepted, so that bishop Keith was no longer primus, according to the second canon of peace, 1727¹."

NOTWITHSTANDING the opposition that the college of bishops, and the anti-catholic party attached to them, had made to the primitive rites in the communion office, yet the catholic doctrines made great progress among the clergy in the northern parts of the kingdom. Mr. Cheyne cites part of a letter from the rev. Robert Lyon, of Perth, who suffered an ignominious death at Carlisle, to bishop Alexander, dated November 28th, shewing the liturgical practice of the church generally, so far, at least, as relates to the Eucharistic service :—"The majority," says Mr. Lyon, "who use the Scotch liturgy, is so great that they are now but very few who do otherwise ; and these few in the southern parts mostly, overawed by some ignorant laity. All in this district [diocese of Dunkeld] are unanimous in the Scotch, save myself ; who, not of inclination, but for reasons too well known, was obliged to comply with borrowing only the invocation and oblation from the Scotch. All in bishop Raitt's district [Brechin] use the Scotch communion office likewise, except two ; but whether these two transpose the oblatory prayer or not, I cannot tell ; but sure I am, bishop Ochterlonie² himself did so. I am likewise sure that the greatest part of the presbyters in Fife, if not all, do use the Scotch and, besides, the most of all these clergy use it in its natural order, according to the edition printed at Aberdeen. It is also well known, and without doubt to yourself, that there is not one single presbyter benorth the Mearns who does not officiate by the Scotch ; so that those who use the English, or who transpose the oblatory prayer, though joined together, are few, yea, very few, upon the comparison. And I am persuaded the most of the clergy of my acquaintance, and with great sincerity I can say it of myself, would much sooner *resign* our several charges *than give up* the Scotch to use the English communion office ; yea, the greatest number even of our laity would desert us should we attempt it."

1744.—THE CLERGY of the district of Edinburgh were dissatisfied with the bishops for holding a synod and enacting canons without having admitted the second order of the bie-

¹ MS. Memoirs, 47, 48.

² Mr. Cheyne's Vindication, p. 30.—"Bishop Ochterlonie was a resolute opponent of the so-called Usages, and the last of the college party, or bishops at large ; and yet he seems to have done himself what he opposed in a general measure."

to their councils. This they complained of as tending to reduce the order of priests to a mere cypher, and involving the management of the affairs of the church into the hands of the episcopal order. In obedience to bishop Keith's letter dated November 5th, 1743, Mr. Auchenleck convened a synod of the district of Edinburgh on the 17th of January, 1744, and communicated to them the contents of the bishop's letter. The synod elected Mr. Auchenleck chairman, who, after consulting the meeting by prayer, said, "By the constitution of the church in Scotland, the bishops [alone] could not hold a synod, and consequently they could not make canons without the concurrence of the presbyters, who made an essential part of the constitution. And he produced an act of parliament passed at the third session of the first parliament of Charles II. in support of what he said, and advanced many other things in favour of the constitution of the church." "Then the presbyters voted,—'Can the bishops of this church hold a synod and make canons without the consent of the presbyters?' To each presbyter, except one, answered, '*they cannot.*' The synod then resolved that an address should be presented, respecting the encroachments made on the privileges of the presbyters, in offering to hold a synod and make canons without their consent, and entreating redress of this grievance, and that in as mild a manner as possible. Accordingly, an address was drawn up and subscribed by eighteen presbyters, and ordered to be entered in the register, and a copy to be sent to each bishop, which was done. But no return was ever received from any of the bishops¹."

THE LETTER above mentioned, of the 17th of January, is preserved in a MS. volume, entitled, "Disputes of the Episcopalists," in the library of the Faculty of Advocates; and I have thankfully availed myself of Mr. Lawson's praise-worthy industry, to give an abridgment of it. After acknowledging the receipt of the primus's letter, and repeating its contents, they continue:—

"WE SHALL not at present trouble your reverences with reasons upon your canons any further than they concern ourselves, and that would not have been our choice, but that the necessities we have put us under would make our silence sinful; with grief of heart we find ourselves obliged to comment upon the proceedings of those whom, by principle and in-

¹ MS. Memoirs 48, 49.

clination, we are much disposed to love and obey. But while we honour your sacred office, and do not at all envy you the dignity to which you have attained, we cannot be quite unconcerned for the rights of our own lower order, when we see designs forming to invade those rights, or to threaten them with danger. This concern we humbly conceive cannot be displeasing to your reverences, if it is considered only as an imitation of that zeal to preserve those rights which some of your venerable numbers shewed when ye were with us; nor can we think it less incumbent upon us to watch over this sacred depositum, that we have now, by what means we shall not say, been long kept in a state of orphanage, without the guidance and protection of a proper head. . . . As we humbly apprehend the constitution of a christian church is a thing so sacred and so determined, that it cannot be new modelled or altered in essentials, upon every revisal made of it by any one of its constituent parts; so it is no more competent to your high order to abolish the presbyterate than it is in our power to renounce or withhold that canonical obedience we owe to our bishops; so it appears to us (. . . .) that by the constitution of the episcopal church of Scotland, the presbyters did sit in synods and church assemblies with their bishops, not barely to hear and propose, but to reason and represent, that they had authoritative voices, and voted decisively in whatsoever question came before them; that not only the deans and other dignitaries of each diocese came to those assemblies in their own right, but the rural clergy were duly represented there by some of their own number, chosen by themselves and sent thither on that purpose, whose votes were numbered with the rest; and, in short, that the powers of legislation and discipline were not then thought to have been lodged in the bishops alone, without the advice and concurrence of their clergy.

“ AS THIS PRIVILEGE of the second order has been long struggled for in other churches, even where papal encroachments went high, and as it is still preserved by our sister church of England, where nothing can have the force of a canon, or regularly pass into ecclesiastical law, without the consent of presbyters, and where each house of convocation has a negative upon the other, so we humbly think it would be rather superfluous than difficult to shew that all this is copied from the primitive pattern, and is well consistent with the Holy Scriptures, and with the constitution and practice of the church of Christ in her purest and best ages. . . . The

on of our church thus appearing to us to be regular, and well founded, we humbly conceive that we are, in conscience, in virtue of the duty we owe to God and church, to your reverences, to ourselves, and to all who may succeed in the second order, earnestly to beg you to stop all further innovation of any sort, and particularly encroachments upon the rights and privileges of our order; or whatever may tend to subverting that good and wholesome constitution. . . . This being our constitution—

considering that you have proceeded single and without a synod, wherein you have made or ratified several, and treated and concluded in matters of legislative discipline relating to the whole church, notwithstanding that members of Scotland were not represented there, nor were they to take that place which belongs to them in synods and councils of the church;—this being the hard case, we humbly beg your reverences will consider seriously what will be the fatal consequence; whether laws and constitutions should be submitted to where the legislation was incomplete, or whether they should be submitted to, whether the constitution of the church would not thereby receive a deep wound.

. YOUR NINTH canon seems chiefly intended for a particular purpose in the city of Edinburgh, where, should it take effect, our bishop, when God shall bless us, would be robbed of a part of his flock and a considerable number of his clergy, and all the refugees from his diocese would take shelter under the patronage of the exiled bishop; as on all these accounts we find it incumbent in our present circumstances, to guard against it, so we humbly conceive it is directly repugnant to the plan of episcopacy, to the polity and canons of the ancient church, which, instead of encouraging a bishop to have his residence and public worship within the diocese of which he was bishop, forbade and condemned non-residence, declared there should be but one bishop in one city, and piously believed there is but one God, one Christ the Lord, and one apostle, so there ought to be but one bishop in a catholic province. . . . We were assured some years ago, that the members of a vacant diocese had inherent rights and privileges, that it belonged to them to elect their own bishop—they might of themselves meet for that purpose, as well as to elect a metropolitan—and that a mandate from the metropolitan or from the province was not necessary, unless the presbytery had been called backward in the matter; but now, by the third

canon, we are told the contrary. . . . The circumstances of our church are much the same as they were about seventeen years ago, when you declared, in like solemn manner, that no good order or unity could be maintained in the church without a metropolitan. We would have taken no notice of this your third canon, were it not intended to give a secret blow to the rights and privileges of the see of Edinburgh, whereof we humbly think ourselves guardians during the vacancy.

“ BY YOUR fourth, fifth, and seventh canons . . . and the ones referred to in the beginning of this paper, we humbly conceive the rights of our order are stripped to a shadow, and our privileges greatly shortened of what your reverences thought once they should be. We might then meet and elect a bishop without waiting for leave from the metropolitan, but now we must not without a mandate from your temporary primus. The semblance of power still left us to choose a bishop, is made void and elusory, while your reverences have reserved for yourselves a faculty of rejecting our elect without giving us a reason, only telling us you have reasons that satisfy yourselves ; and thus we must be sent to elect over and over again, till we come to the happy favourite who may be most acceptable to your reverences, though perhaps least fit for us and the purposes of his high calling. . . . To complete this new scheme of ecclesiastical polity, our second order, which in former times had a right to sit and vote in assemblies of the church, not only by deans and other dignified persons, but by the proctors of the inferior clergy, in proportion to their numbers and the extent of each diocese, is henceforth to be represented in your future synods by one *cypher*, a mere titular dean, who may hear and speak, but is by no means to be allowed the privilege of voting We hope your reverences will not think us presbyterians for affirming the just rights of the second order. Some of the greatest men our island has produced were of the same sentiments, and the best of our kings, who died a martyr for the church, came to find, too late, that a moderate episcopacy was the best.

“ WE SOLEMNLY DECLARE before God and the world, that we have no intention nor desire to restrain the just powers, or to invade the due privileges of your sacred order, as we dare not surrender those of our own ; being sensible that encroachments from either side would be equally fatal to the church, as equally endangering her constitution. . . . As this humble address and memorial is well meant, we hope your reverences will take it in good part. It is still in your power to restore peace

and honour to this distressed church, by agreeing to let her polity stand upon the old true foundation¹." It is signed by Thomas Auchinleck, the moderator, and by eighteen priests.

THE DISCONTENT of the clergy of Edinburgh was now so great that they unhappily had entered into correspondence with Mr. George Smith, one of the non-juring bishops in England that had been consecrated, in 1728, by the party that separated from the original non-juring succession, about the matter of the Usages². The schism occasioned by the "bishops at large" had died out in the person of bishop Ochterlonie; but the schismatical spirit, it would appear, had still remained in many of the clergy. This was increased by the unbending exclusiveness of the bishops, who seemed to have answered none of their letters or addresses, contrary to that courtesy which the Apostle recommends, and the transaction of business requires. Bishop Smith took advantage of the deposition of Mr. Fyfe to make himself a "busy-body;" and he wrote to bishop Keith, requesting him to restore Fyfe; which being declined, bishop Smith took him into communion with himself. This occasioned some unpleasant correspondence, and a threat from bishop Smith of creating a formal schism in the Scottish church, by the consecration of one of the Edinburgh clergy a bishop, in opposition to the indigenous prelates. This most unnatural and schismatical conduct on the part of bishop Smith produced the following letter from the primus, dated May 22d:—

"RIGHT REVEREND BROTHER,—At your desire I saw the letter of April 2d, which you sent to the Rev. Mr. John M'Kenzie of this city. I thank you for the favour, although I cannot but acknowledge the contents did surprise me not a little. The suppositions you are pleased to form to yourself, and the things which you say that you see in our late minutes, my most inward conscience knows to be altogether groundless. I am sorry to find you forming a resolution to set forward an illicit consecration in this country, and thereby to raise a most horrid schism in this free and independent church, for no cause whatsoever that any indifferent persons, even in your own country, will be able, I dare presume, to discern. I can assure you there is neither any alteration intended here in the public worship, nor is there any complaint in all this kingdom

¹ Cited from the MS. in Lawson's History of the Scottish Episcopal Church, from the Revolution to the present Time, pp. 270-276.

² Vide Perceval's Apology, 248.

upon that score, except, perhaps, by the seditious of Edinburgh, who, under that sculk, are fond to palliate their old rancour, envy, and hatred of us bishops. They will not venture, I suppose, to hold up their hands, and take the great omniscient Being to witness, who knows and searches their hearts, that the case of either the English or the Scottish liturgy is the true cause of their quarrel with us; otherwise how should it come to pass that all and every one of them have administered the holy eucharist by the Scottish liturgy only, or by some addition, diminution, or transportation, in the English office, and this of their own accord, without any force or persuasion whatsoever? Must not, then, their application to you proceed from some other secret fountain, and tend towards a different view than what they suffer you to discern? They want to wrest the episcopate from us, and to obtain this they are willing to purchase your assistance at any rate—an assistance which, I humbly think, you ought not to send them, as you will be answerable to Almighty God for the many unhappy consequences that must inevitably follow upon it; for do you think, my dear brother, that your intermeddling in our affairs will create peace amongst us? No, by no means, but rather strife, contention, and every evil work. And will not this prove a melancholy reflection to you at the last, especially since you have neither just call nor title to mix in our church? No person could speak more strongly against such a practice than you have done in your letters, both to bishop Gillan and me, excerpts from which (lest ye keep not copies) I here send you, and therefore I would fain hope you will still conform yourself to your former sober and sage declarations. Let not, I beseech you, the fallacious representations of designing men (however varnished over) so far prevail with you as to kindle such a flame in your neighbour's house as may not only consume him but yourself also. Hitherto we have lived in good correspondence with the church of England. We have declined, when solicited, to act the part which you now threaten us with, as you yourself may very well know. We have always looked upon her as a sister church, and we desire still to continue in communion and fellowship with her. Her liturgy was never prohibited in this country, but always allowed; nor, as I wrote you the 13th Decem^{ber} last, shall any clergyman here receive any molestation upon account of his using it, as it is most certain that no person has to this day suffered the smallest frown upon that head. May not I then, as a brother, as a friend, as a neighbour, obtest you, and even expect that ye will desist from

his unwary enterprise; but if ye needs must proceed in so unjustifiable a step, I believe I may assure you, on very good ground, that the very name of a stranger bishop coming to meddle in our matters in so extraordinary a manner would ruin the cause you would wish to support, more than anything you could devise; and I am even suspicious that your over-doing at this time by your letters, will keep your point at greater distance than if ye had said less upon the head. People don't like to be imperiously dealt by. Thus, dear sir, I have discharged the duty I thought incumbent upon me, as bearing, though unworthy, the same sacred character with yourself; and God grant that both you and I may so demean ourselves in our office, that when the Chief Shepherd shall appear we may receive some approbation from Him.

“(Signed) ROBERT KEITH¹.”

THIS EXCELLENT LETTER does not seem to have brought bishop Smith to a better sense of his duty. The Edinburgh clergy shewed great impatience under what they called their orphanancy;” but it appears to me that there was at that time tacit understanding amongst the bishops that the *primus* was always to be the bishop of Edinburgh, and the bishop of that see, if it was full, to be the *primus*. In his Life of Bishop Keith, bishop Russell appears to discredit the opinion that he was ever elected to the see of Edinburgh; yet as his residence was in the Canongate of that city, and he had resigned his diocese of Fife, it is probable that it had been the intention of his brethren that he should take the oversight of the diocese of Edinburgh. To counteract the insidious conduct of Smith, the *primus* drew up the following declaration, and transmitted to his brethren for signature. It is dated July 12, 1744:—

“IMO. WHEREAS, by the preface to bishop Rattray's Ten canons, passed and ratified in our synod, holden at Edinburgh the month of August, 1743, it is represented that the bishops of the church of Scotland being now, by the good providence of God, perfectly united in one and the same mind, and that the concordates that were framed while some unhappy differences subsisted among them, are thereby vacated, we hereby declare that this expression (which, together with the whole preface, was the work of bishop Rattray), as well as the canons themselves, regards only the concordates being vacated through the total demise of one party of those bishops,

who contracted and concurred in framing the concordates; but that it never was intended (as some persons have suspected) to prohibit or restrict the use of the English liturgy in this kingdom. So far from this, that we declare the use of the liturgy has been, and shall be, as free to any presbyter that chooses to minister by it, as it was and has been at any time by virtue of the concordates.

“2DO. WE DECLARE that we are in full communion with the church of England, as a sister church, and are ready to give outward evidence hereof on all occasions, like as we expect the same compliance from members of that church when occasion shall offer. May the church of England long preserve the just esteem and veneration it has gained in the christian world! may this esteem be always on the increase! and may the gates of hell never be able to prevail either against it or this church! and may both churches ever continue to cultivate union and harmony together, to the credit of our holy religion and to the promoting of true piety and virtue!

3TIO. FOR OURSELVES, as we know that in the present situation of this church we have no external coercive power, so we esteem the concurrence of our presbyters and people the only support under God of our episcopal government, and whenever we are made sensible of any just grievances, both duty and interest will oblige us speedily to remove them. It is the love and prayers of our clergy and people that must strengthen our hands. Each of us, in particular, is blessed with most dutiful and obliging presbyters, and we declare that we will do nothing of moment without consulting them; and this union we trust will stand firm against all opposition; we must stand or fall together. (Signed) Ro. Keith, *primus*. Will. Dunbar, *bishop*. Ro. White, *bishop*. William Falconar, *bishop*. John Alexander, *bishop*¹.”

UPON BISHOP KEITH'S resignation of the diocese of Fife, the clergy elected bishop White, of Dunblane, who was immediately translated in 1743. In the beginning of the present year, bishops Keith, Dunbar, White, Falconar, Raitt, and Alexander, signed a mandate to the clergy of Dunblane to elect a bishop for that diocese in room of bishop White, who had been translated to Fife. “In consequence of which mandate all the presbyters of Dunblane met in the town of Dunblane on the 17th day of July, 1744, and elected the Rev.

¹ Cited by Mr. Lawson, from MS., pp. 278, 279.

Mr. Thomas Oglevie, of Kinnalie, minister of the episcopal congregation in Brechin, to be their bishop; but the bishops never consecrated him, for reasons best known to themselves —N.B. Mr. Oglevie was not for introducing the usages²."

As THE BISHOPS had made no return to the address of the presbyters of Edinburgh of the 17th of last January, Mr. Auchenleck again convened them on the 27th of July. The author of the Memoirs says, "The presbyters being convened by their preses, they were surprised that no returns had been made by any of the bishops to their address of January 17, and they complained that they were ill used by spreading anonymous papers through town and country, discrediting their address and reflecting on their conduct, and therefore they resolved to apply in particular to bishop Keith, who was appointed by the bishops to correspond with vacant districts, representing the hard usage they met with, and entreating the bishops to restore peace to the church. Immediately a letter was written and subscribed by the preses, and sent to bishop Keith, putting him, and, by his means, the other bishops, in remembrance, that on the 11th day of January, 1740, they had addressed the bishops for leave to elect a person to fill this see, which was then vacant by demise of bishop Freebairn; and upon the 17th of April in the same year they repeated the same earnest request; but all without any effect, or any notice taken by the bishops of their destitute condition or humble supplications. And that upon the 17th day of January last, they had again addressed the bishops; not for what they had so often asked them in vain, but humbly to entreat they would revise the proceedings of the late synod, by which the presbyters thought themselves aggrieved, in so far as the constitution of the church whereof they are members; the right of this diocese, whereof they are guardians; and the rights of their common order, for which they could not be altogether unconcerned, seemed to be threatened with danger from the regulations then made. They also complained of indirect practices used, by spreading little anonymous schedules and unsubscribed papers through town and country to discredit their address, and to represent them as men void not only of principle and all virtue, but even of common sense, and fit to be considered only as objects of hatred and contempt, and many other ill usages from unknown persons. They also entreated that the bishops would without delay give the proper and necessary assurances, that the English

¹ MS. Memoirs, 53, 54.—Keith's Catalogue, Appen. 548.

liturgy shall neither be actually nor virtually proscribed; but that the full use of it be continued to such as have a mind. That the peace of the church be not disturbed, and her very being endangered by any attempts to introduce new liturgies and ordinals, and that they will annul the force of such canons of their synod as look with an ill aspect upon the constitution of the church in general, the privileges of the diocese of Edinburgh, and the rights of the presbyters¹".

IT SEEMS rather strange that none of the bishops made any reply to this or to any of the former letters of the Edinburgh clergy. Bishop Keith's letter, subsequently given, in some degree explains this continued silence; nevertheless, an acknowledgment of the receipt of the different communications might have been made. On the other hand, bishop Smith's conduct is very unbecoming a true churchman, and inclines me to think that the schism in the church in England must have been on the side of the non-jurors; for surely no man zealous for the unity of the church, would have acted as he did. The following document was prepared in a synodical meeting of the bishop and clergy of Dunkeld, and shows that Smith had been attempting to revive the ancient pretensions of the see of York. It is dated Alloa, October 22, 1744:—

"WHEREAS the right rev. bishop Smith, of England, has by several letters of his to the right rev. bishop Keith, the rev. Mr. John Mackenzie, and several others in Scotland plainly assumed to himself a superiority, to which he can have no pretension, over the bishops and clergy of this national church, and has declared that he still owns as a presbyter Mr. David Fyfe, formerly indeed a presbyter in this church, but canonically deposed by the bishops thereof, a thing contrary to all order and discipline, and to that principle of unity so carefully preserved in the first and purest ages of the church: WE, the subscribing bishops and presbyters, have thought ourselves in duty bound, for the preservation of our own rights and independency, and in defence and maintenance of the principle as well as the forms and constitution of the catholic church of Christ, to disclaim, and we do disclaim, and will, to the utmost of our power, oppose all usurped authority over, or encroachments upon, the bishops and clergy of this church; and do testify (as we here most sincerely do) our abhorrence of all principles and practices tending to destroy order and discipline, and to defeat that regular exercise of authority, without which neither can possibly subsist, and to the pro-

¹ MS. Memoirs, 49, 50.

dacing and fomenting of schisms in the church, to the great hurt and hindrance of true religion, and with infinite danger to the consciences of men. Declaring always, as we hereby declare, that we are and own ourselves to be of the same communion with the church of England, and will endeavour on our part to preserve union with her as members of the same mystical body of the Lord Jesus.—(*Sic subscribitur*), JOHN ALEXANDER, bishop of Dunkeld; William Seton, dean and presbyter in Forfar, and by ten other presbyters¹.”

AS NO ANSWER had been returned to their address of the 17th of July, the Edinburgh clergy again met on the 22d of December, and elected the rev. James Mackenzie their chairman. Mr. Mackenzie acquainted his brethren, “That the bishops of this church were offended at some expressions in their two former addresses, but did not complain so much of the matter as of the *manner* of them. He therefore desired to know if it was thought proper to send a new address to the bishops, in a most submissive manner, which might be a good step towards peace; to which the presbyters agreed, so willing were they to try every method they could think of to accommodate matters. An address was immediately drawn up, wherein the presbyters do regret the present troubled and divided state of this poor afflicted church, and desire, from the bottom of their hearts, to remove the unhappy misunderstanding betwixt the bishops and them; acknowledging, that if any of the terms or phrases in their former address were, in the judgment of the bishops, stronger and less guarded than the respect due from inferiors towards their superiors required them to have been, they disclaimed and renounced them, begged pardon for them, and offered themselves ready to make what satisfaction they could, or the bishops could demand of them. But as to the substance and matter of the addresses, they would not depart from them, as containing a defence of what they humbly conceived to be the constitution of the national church; and of those things which they judged to be their undoubted rights and privileges, as they were members of it. And therefore sum up their grievances in five articles, drawn up in a naked artless manner, without any reasoning upon them, and beg that they may be redressed².

“THE FIRST IS, that the bishops make null and void the canons of the late synod, as having no proper authority, and

¹ Cited by Mr. Lawson, History, 279, 280.

² MS. Memoirs, 51, 52.

redress the grievances consequent upon them; and that no new canons be made, or be binding upon the clergy and laity of this church, without competent authority. *The second*, that since the first article of the last concordate has been frequently violated and broken through, viz. that we shall only make use of the Scottish or English liturgies in the public or divine service, nor shall we disturb the peace of the church by introducing into the public worship any of the ancient usages, concerning which there has been lately a difference among us, and that we shall censure any of the clergy who act otherwise; the present bishops do each of them subscribe to this as a condition of peace and union, and any who shall be hereafter promoted, immediately before his consecration; and that they give proper assurance for the due execution of it, without any mutilation, alteration, or transposition in either of the offices, in the administration of baptism, confirmation, and of the Lord's Supper, and in the ordination of presbyters and the consecrations of bishops. *The third*, that the privilege of electing their bishops be ascertained to the presbyters of this church in their respective districts, and that the bishops be obliged to consecrate the elect upon presenting the instruments of election subscribed by a majority of the presbyters of the district, except they make relevant objections against the faith or morals of the elect, and prove them in a regular canonical manner. *The fourth*, that the division of districts made by the concordate be observed, or reduced by a common consent, to six or seven, which will serve all the needful occasions of episcopal administrations in this church, and that no election be made without calling all the presbyters of that district to it. *The fifth*, that in conferring holy orders, and in exercising acts of discipline within each district, every thing of moment be managed by the common consent of the bishop and his presbyters¹.

“THESE GRIEVANCES the presbyters think they have a right to demand the redress of; but they choose rather earnestly to entreat it for love sake, and for the tenderness of your own paternal bowels, which we flatter ourselves are not quite shut up against us. If you do but vouchsafe so much as to give us an answer, we shall consider it as a happy interruption of that distance and cold reserve that we have been so long in, and with such a mortifying severity punished withal, and as a blessed presage of having a door opened for our re-admission to your good graces, which would once more revive our droop-

¹ MS. Memoirs, 52, 53.

ing spirits, not only as it would be the most sensible happiness we could desire for ourselves, but as we think it would be a great step towards restoring peace to the church, towards relieving the minds of the faithful from distressing jealousies and contentious disputes, and setting them at liberty to exert their whole force in the study and exercise of solid piety and true religion¹.” (Signed) “JAMES M’KENZIE.”

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs says, the above address “was the last paper the presbyters sent to the bishops; who had kept them in a state of orphanage, without a proper bishop, for five years. It is not easy to *conjecture* a reason for this conduct of the bishops. Some fancy it was because the presbyters would not elect any one of them as bishop of Edinburgh. If this was their reason, it was not without ground; for their aims, and, I am sorry to say it, pernicious schemes, were too well known to the majority of the presbyters of Edinburgh, that ever one of them should, by the election of the presbyters, be advanced to that high station².”

1745.—TO THE FOREGOING address the primus sent the following answer, dated January 25th, and addressed to the chairman of the late meeting, Mr. J. M’Kenzie, and his co-presbyters of the diocese:—

“MY REVEREND BRETHREN,—There was sent to me, some time ago, a paper that appears to have been signed by your preses, in your name and by your appointment, and is addressed to the bishops of this national church.

“I PERSUADE myself, my brethren, I need but point out to your reflection, without taking any pains to prove it, that in the nature of the thing it is impossible that any distinct and decisive answers should be given to the demands or proposals your address contains, without a meeting of the bishops; since no one can take upon him to speak in the name of the rest, nor all of us, by single and separate opinions, determine matters that plainly require the authority of a synod.

“YOU WILL EASILY understand, too, that such meetings are, to some of our number, attended with no small difficulty, through age, infirmity, distance of place, and other circumstances. It is not unreasonable, therefore, that before they submit to all the inconveniences of the thing, they should desire to see that disposition on your part that may encourage them to meet with any agreeable success. How shall they be

¹ MS. Memoirs, 52, 53.

² Ibid. 53.

persuaded of this, my dear brethren, whilst you take [no] notice of the paper I lately offered to you, and which contains in it matters of so great moment to our common interest, both yours and ours? How shall they believe that a zeal for the rights of this national church, under any notion or apprehension of them, really animates your proceedings, if, when her most undoubted rights are openly invaded, her independency struck at, you are careless and unconcerned? But, however much this subject may deserve, and certainly it does deserve, your attention, the practices among us that gave occasion for, and receive countenance and encouragement from, the encroachment we complain of, afford matter of more formidable apprehension still, and deeper concern. Order and government, a reverence for the laws, and obedience to those that bear rule—things so valuable and of so great importance to the peace and welfare of all society—are in the church (from the connection they have with, and their subserviency to, the great ends of religion) yet more precious and important, and as such have ever been dear to good men. What, then, can more sensibly touch you than the prospects we have now before us? When clergymen so far lose sense of that duty and obedience they owe to their superiors, that, admonished by their bishops, they disregard it—censured by them, they shake off their authority; when the people come to believe, that after a clergyman is canonically deposed, his ministrations may be as valid as before, and that with safety to their consciences they may adhere to him as their pastor, though in direct contradiction to the most primitive and truly catholic principles; then surely all discipline is dissolved, all government is subverted, and it may seem idle in circumstances of this sort to dispute what is or what ought to be the peculiar constitution of a national church, since it is evident—demonstratively evident—that when such opinions and such practices prevail, none can be of any signification. These are dangers, my brethren, real and great, and justly alarming. How is it, then, that ye refuse to give attention to them, though called upon to do so? Are the interests of religion, the great ends of true piety, better served? Is the glory of God, is the salvation of men, more advanced by order and discipline, and a due respect for authority, or by licentiousness and revolt, and that confusion that always follows them? Ways there are, we know—the Scripture assures us of it—that may seem right to a man in his own eyes, though, in conclusion, they are the ways of death. And never, surely, ought the parties of the church to watch with more anxious care, or

with louder cries, than when there is danger of so fatal
re.

I MIGHT blame me, perhaps, and I should blame myself
I passed over in silence those expressions of filial affec-
his last address from you contains. Nothing could be
reeable to us. I speak it with confidence for my bre-
ne other bishops, as well as for myself; nothing is
e object of our wish than to be possessed of your love
em, and that there should ever subsist between us that
able union which, by the strongest ties of duty and
e, and common interest, there ought to be. But cer-
ow is the time when you who have indeed a regard for
r ought to shew that you have, and when it cannot be
that where it appears it really is.

U SEE THE condition we are reduced to, the difficulties
ouragements that press us on every side. You see our
y despised and defeated at home, invaded and insulted
road, left destitute of all support but the little it can
from the principles and conscience of a very few. At
nd in circumstances of so great distress to us, what
ection can remain insensible? Can it be alive and
ken? At such a time, my brethren, do you refuse us
stance we so much need, and might so justly expect
it? Rather suffer your own rights to be encroached
join with us in asserting ours? Formally compliment
ly arraign us, not considering that when ye do so ye
that reverence for our office and character which alone
port it in our present circumstances. Possess the peo-
fears and jealousies, the never-failing source of dis-
and calamity to this nation; give encouragement to
and practices of the most dangerous tendency, and
sh the small remains of christian principles among us,
as smouldering flax in the minds of too many. Judge
es, my brethren; I speak as to those that know.
ese things to be? May the infinite, great, and good
th whom is counsel, and from whom it comes, direct
ultations, to the glory of His name and the peace of
cted church; and the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ
your spirits. *Amen.*—(Signed) ROBERT KEITH¹."

AN REALLY desirous of peace, and who were sincerely
it, the primus's letter might have been satisfactory;
quite evident that the clergy of Edinburgh were at
actuated by a bad spirit. They appear to have at-

tempted to assume the old designation of the "watch-tower" of the nation, and to make a title which they had applied to themselves, of the conservators of the spiritualities of the diocese, a position of real power and authority. Their last address was written in a dictatorial spirit; they demanded the abrogation of canons that had given general satisfaction to their brethren in the other parts of the kingdom; they attempted to dictate to their superiors the manner of their election and their number, and to impose their opinions upon the bishops that were in future to be consecrated, by a previous subscription. The whole spirit, as well as the letter of their address, is undutiful, and shews an evident attempt at a supremacy, in their collective capacity, over the chief governors of the church. In short, they attempted to resuscitate bishop Leighton's Accommodation, wherein the bishop was to be merely a constant moderator, but all real power was to reside in the collective body of the presbyters. On the other hand, the bishops seem to have treated the clergy of Edinburgh with cold and haughty reserve, which is strongly evinced in their never having replied, either individually or collectively, to the repeated addresses of the clergy. There seems to have been a misunderstanding on both sides. Bishop Keith's letter, however, might have restored harmony among them, had there been a disposition to "walk humbly." They were irritated at having been deprived of the privilege of electing a bishop for their see, to which, till then, metropolitanical powers had been attached; and having had it in view to elect one of their own number to that see, disappointed ambition might have kept up and increased the irritation. With respect to the canons whose abrogation they so urgently demanded, we have Mr. Skinner's authority, who was himself then a priest in the diocese of Aberdeen, and who must have known the sentiments of his brethren, that they gave general satisfaction. When, says he, "these canons were intimated to the inferior clergy, a few in the metropolis, who had one of their own number in view for the episcopate, though they knew he would not be acceptable to the bishops, objected to one of the canons as an infringement of their right of election, and to others as curtailing the powers of their ordinary, as bishop of Edinburgh. But these objections were considered of no weight by the clergy in the other parts of the kingdom, who all dutifully acquiesced in the proceedings of the late synod, and looked forward with much satisfaction to what they hoped would be the peaceful and pleasing consequences of it¹."

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 660.

CHAPTER LXX.

BY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND ROBERT KEITH,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

the Church.—PRINCE CHARLES EDWARD—his invasion—erects
—takes possession of Edinburgh.—Battle of Preston-pans—
presbyterian ministers—conduct of the clergy—advances to Eng-
Derby—his retreat.—1746.—Invests Stirling Castle—battle
retreats—establishes head-quarters at Inverness.—Battle of Cul-
les escapes.—Duke of Cumberland's conduct—his destruction of
at Sonehaven.—Fraserburgh.—Position of the church —Military
ed.—Persecution commenced.—Mr. Skinner.—Fears of the
—Act of parliament.—Sufferings of the clergy—several examined
eriff of Kincardine.—Two clergymen tried at Carlisle—and
th of bishop Dunbar.—1747.—Election of bishop Gerard—
on.—Mr. Sempel imprisoned.—University of St. Andrews.—
cutting act amended—clauses of the act—its comprehensiveness.
n of orders.—Informers encouraged.—Laborious exertions of the
se clergymen tried—convicted and imprisoned—evidence against
fence.—The tolbooth.—Divine service outside the gaol.—The bag-
isms.—Children brought for baptism in fishwomen's baskets.—
Charles Edward—on the duke of Cumberland.—Débates in par-

SINCE THE death of bishop Rose, the church had
ernal rest;—during that interval her afflictions
herself. The presbyterians having now acquired
ed legal establishment, and the parish churches
s being altogether in their possession, they had, in
sure, ceased from troubling the bishops and clergy.
ual congregations were numerous in every corner of
n, amounting to upwards of 300, and attached
ors; and there was every appearance of increas-
ty and extension of the church. But, as if God
d a controversy with her, and intended still farther
d humble her, He permitted an event with which

as a church she had no concern to be the cause of the worst persecution which she had yet experienced, and which entirely arose from a different quarter.

ALTHOUGH DEPRIVED by force of the crown to which he was born, the son of king James VII. had never renounced his claim as the true and lineal heir to it; and a large party, in all the three kingdoms, were firmly attached to the house of Stuart. He, however, begat a son who determined to redeem the time that his father had lost in fruitless negotiations and chimerical hopes of a second restoration. CHARLES EDWARD had served in the French armies, and was not deficient in military knowledge. It is evident, from the letters of Louis de Bouillone and the prince de Campo Florida, that prince Charles had received promises that military support should be afforded him from the courts of France and Spain, as soon as they heard of his having landed in Scotland¹. He arrived, in a French privateer of 18 guns, in the beginning of August, on the coast of South Uist and Barra, and the vessel hovered about for a day or two on the coast of the main land that lies betwixt the point of Ardnamurchan and Glenelg. His whole armament consisted of about thirty Irish and French officers, a Mr. Sheridan, and lord George Murray, brother of the duke of Athole². Along with these he brought "about 1600 bad guns, and as many worse swords . . . and there is but one of his officers that ever was so high in rank as lieutenant-colonel. I hear of no more that has yet joined him. He sets up his standard on Monday, at Glenfinnon, which is the outlet from Moydart and Arisack to Lochaber." The government was taken by surprise, and sir John Cope was in no condition to meet the body of highlanders who had flocked to his standard; and, as old Lovat said, "with such a desperate bold prince as they had at their head, there will be much blood shed; and this rising will be more troublesome to government than in the year 1715³." On the 27th of August, Charles's muster roll was 2030 men, and hearing of sir John Cope's advance, he halted at Lagganrange, about four miles from Fort Augustus, at the foot of the Corryarrick. Here Charles assumed the highland garb, and, "at tying the latches of his shoes, he solemnly declared that he would be up with Mr. Cope before they were unloosed." But Cope gave him the slip by marching straight forward on the other side of the hill, and so reached Inverness in safety. Both armies turned their rear to each other; but Charles took advantage of Cope's blunder, and hastened to

¹ Culloden Papers, 205, 206.

² Ibid. 203-208.

³ Ibid. 215.

burgh, of which he took possession, and proclaimed his
er on the 17th of September¹.

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs says, sir John Cope *fled* to In-
ness,—“he thought fit to fly with his troops to Inverness.”
marched his army from that town to Aberdeen, where he
arked his men in transports on Sunday night, and having
ir wind, he debarked his troops at Dunbar on the Tuesday
wing. General Wightman, who was a spectator, writes
Mr. Forbes, the lord president, —“I posted myself, on
urday morning by break of day, on the rear of Hamilton’s
oons, about a musket-shot from them [at the battle of
ston-pans], and had not stationed myself above three
utes when *the scuffle* began (I say scuffle, for battle it was
, which lasted about four minutes, and no longer; for
ilton’s dragoons, who were upon the left wing, wheeled to
ight . . . upon the approach of the Edinburgh riff-raff
nteers, without firing or being fired upon, and without
ring a sword².” This *scuffle* was performed on the
ing of 21st of September, when Charles “attacked
and gave them a total route, killed many, and took
y prisoners; were not only masters of the field of battle,
took all their cannon and military chest. Sir John Cope,
some dragoons, making their escape, fled to England.
victory so intimidated the presbyterian or established
gy, that they fled from Edinburgh, deserting their flocks
families; and though they were promised protection, and
ted to preach next day, being Sunday, yet they absconded
would not appear. The episcopal clergy, behaving as
d, shunned to give offence to either party, performed di-
offices in their accustomed manner, and continued doing
ll the 28th day of April, 1746, when all the episcopal
gy in Edinburgh, by advice of their best friends, gave up
public ministrations³.” Smollett says, that “while the
ce resided in Edinburgh, some of the presbyterian clergy
inued to preach in the churches of that city, and publicly
ed for king George, without suffering the least punishment
molestation. One minister in particular, of the name of
vicar, being solicited by some highlanders to pray for their
ce, promised to comply with their request, and performed
promise in words to this effect:—‘And as for the young
ce, who is come hither in quest of an earthly crown, grant,

¹ Culloden Papers, *passim*.—MS. Memoirs, 34.

² Culloden Papers. 224.

³ MS. Memoirs, p. 55.

O Lord, that he may *speedily* receive a crown of glory!¹ This was, in effect, to pray that he might soon be killed.

HAVING INCREASED his force to about seven thousand men Charles made a rapid march into England by the western border. He took and garrisoned Carlisle, where his father was proclaimed. He now received promises of reinforcements from France. He marched on foot, in the highland dress, at the head of his ragged army, and arrived at Manchester on the 29th of November, where he established his head quarters. He was received in that town with marks of affection, and was joined by about two hundred men. On the 4th of December he entered Derby, and had he been permitted to have advanced with the celerity he practised, he might have possessed himself of the capital, whilst the duke of Cumberland was only collecting an army at Litchfield. But the highland chiefs began to murmur, and their clans to be unruly; and at a council of war the chiefs determined on retreating with all expedition. Horse and dragoons were immediately despatched in pursuit; these hung upon the rear of the highlanders, and harassed them in their retreat, but which was, nevertheless, admirably conducted. On the 19th December, Charles reached Carlisle, the garrison of which he reinforced, and then continued his retreat into Scotland. "He thus accomplished one of the most surprising retreats that ever was performed. But the most remarkable circumstance of this expedition was the moderation and regularity with which those ferocious people conducted themselves in a country abounding with plunder. No violence was offered; no outrage committed; and they were effectually restrained from the exercise of rapine. Notwithstanding the excessive cold, the hunger, and fatigue to which they must have been exposed, they left behind no sick, and lost a very few stragglers; but retired with deliberation, and carried off their cannon in the face of their enemy²."

1746.—EDINBURGH was now in possession of general Hawley, with a considerable body of men. Charles was therefore obliged to conduct his retreat towards the west, by Dumfries to Glasgow³. At both of these towns he exacted large contributions. From Glasgow he proceeded northward, but was checked at Stirling, which he invested. General Hawley now moved westward, and took up a position about two miles beyond Falkirk. On receiving intelligence of this march,

¹ Continuation of Hume's England, xi. 163-64. 8vo. ed. 1790.

² Ibid. xi. 172.

³ Culloiden Papers, 263.

Charles moved forward on Friday the 17th of January, by Dunipace and Torwood, to offer him battle, and the attack was made about half-past three o'clock in the afternoon. The highlanders were attacked by the dragoons, who were received with so well directed a fire that they immediately retreated, disordering their infantry; and a terrible storm of wind and rain from the westward coming on, the battle became a complete route. "Had the enemy staid a quarter of an hour longer on the ground, they must inevitably have been cut to pieces. . . . We took all their cannon all their ammunition, tents, three standards, two stand of colours, a kettle-drum, many small arms, their baggage, clothing, and generally every thing they had not burnt or destroyed. We made about 700 prisoners, besides officers; and we reckon about 600 were killed in the field of battle, besides what we were told were drowned in fording the river Carron. We had not above forty men killed, among which were two or three captains and some subaltern officers. . . . His royal highness's first care, early next morning, was to send up to the field of battle to bury the dead, as well those of the enemy as our own people, and such of the officers that could be distinguished (. . . .) were brought down to the town to be decently interred, in the same manner as our own officers were. Had not the night come on, and so stormy, his royal highness's army would have got betwixt them and Linlithgow, and would have utterly destroyed them¹."

THIS, HOWEVER, was but a barren victory, for the duke of Cumberland having arrived at Edinburgh with large reinforcements, Charles was obliged to continue his retreat. Stirling being in the hands of his enemies, he was obliged to ascend the river Forth, a few miles to the Ford of Frewe, the place where he had crossed that river in his progress southward. He found great difficulty in subsisting his forces through an exhausted country; but hoping to be reinforced by the long promised troops from France and Spain, he continued his retreat to Inverness, where he fixed his head quarters. The duke of Cumberland followed him as far as to Perth; but dreading the highland road, where Cope had committed such a contemptible blunder, he took the route along the coast to Aberdeen. It was Charles's intention to advance towards Aberdeen to attack the duke, but the clans remonstrated against

¹ Account of the Battle of Falkirk, printed at Bannockburn, 1746.—A Jacobite Relic, published first in the Scottish Episcopal Magazine, vol. iii. 127-130. Anno 1822.

his leaving their families at the mercy of the garrison of Fort William. The duke remained at Aberdeen till the first of April, when he advanced to meet the invader. On the 12th, he passed the deep and rapid river Spey, over which, at that time, there was no bridge, but only a ferry-boat. It was Charles's purpose to have attacked the duke at Nairn; he had reconnoitred the camp, and his army began their march, in two columns, on the night of the 15th. His men, however, were faint with hunger and overcome with sleep, and were unable to proceed; he was, therefore, obliged to return to a position in an open field, called Culloden Muir, where part of his army dispersed to procure provisions, and the rest threw themselves on the ground to sleep. On the 16th the duke advanced with a much superior army, and attacked the highlanders, whose numbers did not exceed four thousand men. In less than half an hour the highlanders were totally routed, and the field covered with their slain.

THE ROAD, AS FAR as Inverness, was covered with dead bodies; and, says Smollett, "a great number of people, who, from motives of curiosity, had come to see the battle, were sacrificed to the undistinguishing vengeance of the victors. . . . The glory of the victory was sullied by the barbarity of the soldiers. They had been provoked by their former disgraces to the most savage thirst of revenge. Not contented with the blood which was so profusely shed in the heat of action, they traversed the field after the battle, and massacred those miserable wretches who lay maimed and expiring; nay, some officers acted a part in this cruel scene of assassination. . . . The vanquished adventurer rode off the field, accompanied by . . . a few horsemen: he crossed the water of Nairn and retired to the house of a gentleman in Stratharrick, where he conferred with old lord Lovat; there he dismissed his followers, and wandered about, a wretched and solitary fugitive, among the isles and mountains, for the space of five months; during which he underwent such a series of dangers, hardships, and misery, as no other person ever outlived. . . . In a word, the gaols of Great Britain, from the capital northwards, were filled with these unfortunate captives; and great numbers of them were crowded together in the holds of ships, where they perished in the most deplorable manner for want of necessaries, air, and exercise. . . . In the month of May the duke of Cumberland advanced with the army into the highlands, as far as Fort Augustus, where he encamped, and sent off detachments on all hands to hunt down the fugitives and lay waste the country with fire and

word. The castles of Glengarry and Lochiel were plundered and burnt; every house, hut, or habitation, met with the same fate, without distinction; all the cattle and provisions were carried off; the men were either shot upon the mountains, or put to death in cold blood, without form or trial; the women, after having seen their husbands and fathers murdered, were subjected to brutal violation, and then driven out naked, with their children, to starve on the barren heaths. One whole family was enclosed in a barn and *con-
nected to ashes!* Those ministers of vengeance were so alert in the execution of their office, that in a few days there was neither house, cottage, man, nor beast to be seen in the compass of fifty miles;—all was ruin, silence, and desolation¹.”

THE DUKE made war upon the church in his progress northward, as well as on the invader of the kingdom and the rival of his house. The author of the *Memoirs* says, “The duke of Cumberland being in the country, having defeated the Highlanders, had ordered all the episcopal meetings in the north of Scotland to be demolished; many of their places for public worship were burnt to the ground, with their Prayer Books and Bibles².” I remember, when very young, to have been, in the house of a worthy old Jacobite lady at Elgin, the Prayer Book and Bible belonging to the chapel at Cullen, which had the marks of fire and the soldiers’ bayonets on it. It had been preserved by some means when the chapel was burnt, and was kept as a relic with great care. In his route through the eastern counties, the duke ordered all the chapels to be burnt, and where in towns it was not possible to burn them without endangering other property, they were pulled down, and their furniture burnt in safe places. In his march northward, the duke halted at Stonehaven, and established his head quarters in the house of Mr. John Young, of Stank, the sheriff of the county of Kincardine. He ordered his soldiers to set fire to the episcopal chapel, because it was alleged that the minister and the greatest part of his congregation had embraced the cause of prince Charles. “And here,” says Mr. Anderson, “we may remark, that there were very few who attended the parish church of Dunnottar, there being not above a dozen of Presbyterians in the old town [of Stonehaven] at this period. . . . Sheriff Young having prevailed on his guest not to destroy the building, it was spared; but the pulpit and all the seats and pews that were in it, were

¹ Continuation of Hume, xi. 183, 184.

² MS. *Memoirs*, 55.

at Alford ; all of whom complied by taking the oaths enjoined. Livingston and Skinner repented, and were absolved by their bishop, Mr. Andrew Gerard¹." The following memorandum, preserved by bishop Russell, from bishop Forbes' Register, informs us that MR. ROBERT FORBES, then a private clergyman in Leith, was imprisoned at this evil time :—" Here a great interruption [to his clerical duties] has happened, by my misfortune of being taken prisoner at St. Ninians, in company with the reverend Messrs. Thomas Drummond and John Willox ; Mr. Stewart Carmichael and Mr. Robert Clerk ; and James Mackay and James Carmichael, servants, upon Sunday, the 7th of September, 1745, and confined in Stirling Castle till February 4th, 1746, and in Edinburgh Castle till May 29th of said year²."

ALTHOUGH MR. SKINNER had taken the oath, yet he does not seem to have fared any better than his brethren. The writer of the Memoir prefixed to his Theological Works, says, he " has often heard him tell, that on coming home one evening from performing an occasional office in the way of his duty, he found his house in the possession of a military party, some of them guarding the door with fixed bayonets, and others searching the several apartments ; even the bedchamber where Mrs. Skinner was lying-in of her fifth child, and little able to bear such a rude, unseasonable visit. No lenity was to be looked for from such unfeeling visitors, who pillaged the house of every thing they could carry with them, hardly leaving a change of linen to father, mother, or child in the family. The chapel, with all its furniture, was destroyed, and for several years the congregation could find no place to meet in for public worship but the clergyman's house, which not being sufficiently large, many of them were obliged to stand in the open air during divine service³."

WHEN CHARLES EDWARD was at Derby, the city of London was filled with terror and confusion ; the traders and money corporations were overwhelmed with fear and dejection. In the most dreadful state of alarm, they prognosticated, says Smollett, " their own ruin in the approaching revolution, and their countenances exhibited the plainest marks of horror and despair⁴." But like a tall bully, when their selfish fears were relieved, their thirst of vengeance made the government resort to the most cruel retaliation, but only on the weaker party.

¹ Memoirs, 55, 56.

² Keith's Catalogue, App. 550, 551.

³ Memoirs prefixed to Mr. Skinner's Theological Works, i. p. ix.

⁴ Continuation of Hume, xi. 170.

the presbyterians suffered no more than if they had all been faithfully on the side of the wearer of the crown. In anticipation of the late enterprise, parliament passed an act "to make it high treason to hold correspondence with the sons of the Pretender to his majesty's crown, and for attainting them of high treason in case they shall land, or attempt to land, in Great Britain, or any of the dominions thereunto belonging; and for suspending the operation and effect of a clause in the act for improving the union of the two kingdoms, relating to forfeitures for high treason, until after the decease of the sons of the said Pretender¹." The government also offered a premium of thirty thousand pounds for Prince Charles's head. But no sooner had they recovered from the fright into which that gallant prince had thrown them, than the following act was passed, in the exterminating spirit of the Solemn League and Covenant. This act, passed without opposition from the *spiritual estate*, so completely prostrated the church of Scotland, that she has not yet recovered from the effects of this vast and most severe of the many stabs under her fifth rib.

AN ACT more effectually to prohibit and prevent pastors or ministers from officiating in episcopal meeting-houses in Scotland, without duly qualifying themselves according to law, and to punish persons for resorting to any meeting-houses where such unqualified pastors or ministers shall officiate:—
 WHEREAS, it is notorious that for many years last past, during the reign of his present majesty . . . a great number of meeting-houses have been set up and maintained in the city of Edinburgh, and other parts of Scotland, by persons professing to be of the episcopal communion, whereof the pastors or ministers have never taken the oaths, &c. . . . nor did ever express words, during the exercise of divine service, pray for his majesty and the royal family; by means whereof those illegal meetings have greatly contributed to excite and foment a spirit of disaffection amongst numbers of persons in that part of the kingdom against his majesty's person and government, which hath been one of the causes of the wicked and unnatural rebellion lately raised and carried on against his majesty, in favour of a popish Pretender.—II. Every person who is now pastor or minister of any episcopal congregation in Scotland, shall, on or before the 1st day of September, 1746, produce to the clerk of the shire, &c. where his meeting-house is situate, a certificate from the proper officer, of his having qualified himself by taking the oaths; . . . and the

¹ Statutes at Large, cxxxix.

clerk of the shire, &c. shall deliver two attested copies of such certificate to such minister or pastor, one of them to be by him fixed on the outside of the meeting-house where he shall officiate, on or near the door thereof.—III. Every pastor or minister, &c. as aforesaid shall pray for the king's most excellent majesty, &c. by name, in the same form of words as are contained in the Liturgy.—IV. Sheriffs, &c. were required, after the 1st of November, forthwith to shut up all meeting-houses where the minister could not produce a certificate, or where he did not pray for king George by name.—V. If any person, from and after the 1st day of September, presume to enter upon or exercise the function of a pastor or minister of any episcopal meeting, &c. without having first registered his orders as before directed, or praying for king George by name &c. "every person so offending in any of the premises, being thereof lawfully convicted before any two or more justices of the peace, or before any other judge competent of the place summarily, shall, for the first offence, suffer imprisonment to the space of six months; and for the second or any subsequent offence, being thereof lawfully convicted before the court justiciary, or any of the circuit courts, shall be adjudged to be transported to some of his majesty's plantations in America for life; and in case any person adjudged to be so transported shall return into, or be found in Great Britain, then every such person shall suffer imprisonment for life!"—VI. And for the better ascertaining what shall be deemed an episcopal meeting-house . . . and to prevent any evasions thereof . . . a meeting, assembly, or congregation in Scotland, where the shall be *five persons* or more assembled and met together, hear divine service, over and besides those of the household if it be in any house where there is a family inhabiting, or it be in a house or place where there is no family inhabiting then where any such five or more persons shall be so assembled and met together to hear divine service, and where divine service shall be performed by a pastor or minister, being of, or professing to be of, the episcopal communion, every such meeting, assembly, or congregation shall be deemed as taken to be an episcopal meeting, within the true intent and meaning of this act.—VII. Sheriffs are enjoined to make diligent inquiries whether or not the clergy comply with this act and where they do not, the sheriff is authorised to shut up and suppress such meeting-houses, and to impose all the penalties.—VIII. Any of the laity who frequented unregistered meeting-houses, or those in which the king was not prayed for, without informing against the minister, were to forfeit the sum

five pounds and to be imprisoned for six months, for the first offence; and for the second, or any subsequent offence, shall suffer imprisonment for two years.—IX. No letters of orders, &c. shall be deemed sufficient, or be admitted to be registered, but such as have been given by some bishop of the church of England or of Ireland. Letters of orders from any Scottish bishop “shall be deemed null and void to all intents and purposes.”—XI. It being just and necessary that those who are disaffected to “the present *happy* establishment should be restrained from the power of hurting” it . . . no peer of Scotland shall be capable of being elected one of the sixteen peers, or of voting in the election of any of the said peers, who shall at any time within one year preceding such election have been twice present at divine service in any episcopal meeting-house or congregation in Scotland, not held and allowed in pursuance of an act 10 Anne, c. 7, “to prevent the disturbing of those of the episcopal communion.”—XII. No person shall be capable of being elected, or of voting in any election of a member of parliament, or of being elected or voting at the election of any magistrate or counsellor for burghs, or of deacon of crafts, or collector or clerk of the land tax or supply, who have been twice present at any of these meetings as foresaid.—XIII. If any person or persons, at any time, either peers or commoners, who shall have any office, civil or military, shall resort to or frequent any episcopal meeting-house or congregation in Scotland, within the meaning of this act, shall be disabled thenceforth, on conviction, to hold such office or offices, and shall forfeit the same.—XIV. And if any judge or magistrate shall be guilty of any wilful neglect or omission of their duty in the premises, they shall forfeit the sum of fifty pounds sterling *toties quoties*.¹

THIS MOST antichristian act was not allowed to remain a dead letter; indeed its last clause gave every judge and magistrate a *personal interest* in persecuting the church, and now reality to extirpate her. “All the episcopal clergy in Scotland, except the five above mentioned [page 325], officiated on the first of September, 1746, from *house to house to four persons* more than the family in which they were, till the first of October, 1748².” These were not solitary instances. The clergy in the diocese of Brechin were harassed by interrogations and examinations before the sheriffs. Persons, as Mr. Anderson, “from almost every quarter in the county [of Kincardine] were examined before the sheriff to give

¹ Statutes at Large, ch. xxxviii.

² MS. Memoirs, 56, 57.

evidence as to whether they had heard or knew of divine service having been performed by any minister of the episcopal communion since the first of September, 1746.—The object of this was to bring to punishment not only the hearers, but those pastors who had not taken the oaths of allegiance, &c. to the king, hence called *non-jurors*, and who continued to pray for the prince¹." Then he states that on the first of October, Mr. John Young, sheriff, before named, summoned James Simpson, gardener at Arbuthnot, and twenty other persons, to make oath to the number of the episcopal meeting-houses within the county not qualified according to law, or where five persons met besides the family. Who being all solemnly sworn, and each of them interrogated, they all deposed negative, and that was the truth as they should answer to God².

A COURT OF OYER AND TERMINER was held at Carlisle, and two clergymen, who had been taken in Cumberland during Charles's retreat, were tried for high treason. The Rev. Robert Lyon officiated at Perth, and had Mr. Drummond, one of the noble family of Perth, for his colleague; the other was the Rev. Thomas Cappoch, an English non-juror. Both of these clergymen had accompanied the prince's army in the capacity of chaplains. They were both cast for death; the latter was hanged at Carlisle on the 11th, and the former on the 28th of October; and both, in their dying speeches, accuse the witnesses of perjury, and the judge, baron Clerk, of the grossest partiality and injustice; and they were both heavily ironed during all the time of their imprisonment. In a letter to his mother, Mr. Lyon says, he acted according to his "conscience and duty by bearing testimony to truth and righteousness, religion and loyalty." Mr. Cappoch says he was pinioned, led through the dirt and nastiness by Mark Kerr's dragoons. He invokes a blessing on his "true, lawful, just, and undoubted sovereign, King James," and adds, "I declare, then, upon the faith of a dying man, that I die an unworthy member of that particular church, the church of England, as she stood before the Revolution, which I firmly believe to be truly catholic and apostolic—free from superstition, on the one hand, and fanaticism and enthusiasm on the other; may she prosper and flourish! may she be like a house founded upon a rock, notwithstanding all attempts and inundations, till time shall be no more! Amen³."

¹ Black-Book of Kincardineshire.

² Ibid.

³ MS. Speeches, published in the Episcopal Magazine, April, 1836, and November, 1838. Vols. iii. and vi. 344.

WORTHY and respected bishop of Aberdeen, and confessor William Dunbar, died at his residence in Peterhead. "He continued to retain that respect and which had uniformly been shewn to his public character, by the prudent discharge of the delicate duties intrusted in this country to episcopal ministrations, the discharge of the church which he had undertaken to serve¹." At this particular juncture the death of bishop Dunbar was a great loss to his clergy, who required the assistance and guidance of a prelate of his distinguished prudence and experience, much more than in times of peace and

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ordered a thanksgiving to be celebrated for the great deliverance they had received. The Earl of Cumberland wrote to them from Inverness, dated the 10th of May, expressing his just sense of their very steady and consistent conduct "through the whole course of this most unnatural, and unprovoked rebellion³."

PERHAPS MODERN ecclesiastical history will not record an act of greater heroism and courage than the meeting of the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen at this time, in the face of the law of 1690, which prohibited any assembly of more than five persons for the purpose of worship, in order to elect a successor to the venerable bishop. They met, however, and elected JOHN ROSE, one of the clergy of Aberdeen, as their bishop, notwithstanding the severe act which rendered it penal for five persons to assemble and meet together for the worship of God. While still in the order of presbyter, several clergymen solicited bishop Rose to promote the interests of the order of the priesthood, because, they said, "having long since preached and exercised the other parts of a minister's office in young Balgowan's family, where he has been long a minister, with universal applause, we could not refuse to obey the recommendation, that he be promoted to the superior degree of a presbyter, and enabled farther to serve and promote the interests of the church, especially when Providence now determines his residence in lord Nairn's family, whither a goodly congregation of devoted country people continue to resort for the benefit of his ministry." Notwithstanding this strong recommendation, Mr. Rose was not ordained priest by bishop Gadderar till the first of January 1728, and he became one of the clergy of Aberdeen in 1728. Mr. Cheyne characterises him as a man

¹ h's Catalogue, Appendix, 533.

² Skinner, ii. 670.

³ Acts of Assembly, 690, 691.

of "deep piety, and manly sense." The primus could not officiate at this consecration, for reasons that are not stated; but he sent a commission to bishop White, who, with the assistance of bishops Falconar, Raitt, and Alexander, consecrated Mr. Gerard at Cupar in Fife on the 17th of July¹. As the law now stood no man could have witnessed this consecration but the parties engaged in it. It was done in secret, otherwise the "angry knuckles of the law" would at least have disturbed, if not entirely have prevented, this solemn action; nevertheless we have the neverfailing promise of God the Son, that "where two or three are gathered together in His name, there he will be in the midst of them."

IT IS STATED in the Scots Magazine for the next year that the Rev. George Sempell was arrested by some military for having been discovered officiating in a room in a private house in Perth to more than four persons. He was sentenced by the magistrates of Perth on the following day to be imprisoned for six months.

AN ACT of parliament was passed this year for uniting the two colleges of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, in the University of St. Andrews. In the body of this act we are informed that "his late majesty king William was graciously pleased, by a grant bearing date the 29th day of April, 1695, to grant to the said principals, professors, and masters in the said University of St. Andrews, and to their successors in office, the yearly sum of three hundred pounds out of the rents and revenues of the bishopricks of Scotland to continue in time coming, and to be paid yearly to the factors of the said colleges of the said university²." An act was also passed for taking away and abolishing the heretable jurisdictions in Scotland, and for restoring such jurisdictions to the crown; and for making more effectual provision for the administration of justice by the king's courts and judges there³.

1748.—AN ACT was passed in the summer of this year, to amend the act of 1746, which was calculated to complete the annihilation of the church. It was entitled, "An act to amend and enforce so much of an act made in the 19th year of his majesty's reign, as relates to the more effectual disarming the highlands in Scotland, and restraining the use of the

¹ Vindication, &c, 20-28.—Prim. Truth and Order, Appen. 522.—List, 39.—Keith, 333.—Skinner, ii. 670.—Perceval, 255.

² Statutes at Large, vol. vii. cap. xxxii. pp. 33, 34.

³ Ibid. cap. xliii. vol. vii. p. 61.

highland dress ; and to masters and teachers of private schools and chaplains ; and to explain a clause in another act made in the same year, relating to letters of orders of episcopal ministers in Scotland, &c.”¹ The restraint on the dress of the highlanders was strongly opposed even by the friends of government, as being “no more than a chip in porridge,” and as decidedly unjust to those clans that had not joined the invaders in 1745. The editor of the Culloden papers says, in a note, “The English readers, and most of the Scotch, will be surprised to understand that the kilt or philabeg was *not* the ancient highland garb, but was introduced into the highlands about 1720, by one Thomas Rawlinson, an Englishman, who was overseer to a company carrying on iron works in Mengarry’s country. The convenience of the dress soon caused it to be universally adopted in the highlands².” The clauses of this act with which we are concerned are those that bear on ecclesiastical affairs:—“And for the better ascertaining what shall be deemed exercising the employment, function, or service, of a minister or chaplain, within the true intent and meaning of the said recited act [19th Geo. II.], be it enacted and declared, that from and after the 29th day of September, 1748, *any person* being or *pretending* to be in holy orders, *of any denomination WHATSOEVER*, other than the ministers, elders, or preachers of the established church of Scotland, who shall preach or perform any divine service in any house or family of which he is not the master, in the presence or hearing of any other person or persons, whether such person or persons be of the family or not, shall be deemed to be he who exercises the employment, function, and service of a chaplain, within the provision and true intent and meaning of the same act³.”

[IT IS EVIDENT from this clause of the act, that the *seceders* from the kirk were included in the prohibition to preach ; but the whole weight and violence of it fell *exclusively* upon the *holie* church of Scotland. No author that ever I have seen has noticed that *all denominations* whatsoever came within the meaning of the act which made it penal to preach to five persons. The seceders, however, escaped all penalties ; in fact, the idea of troubling them never once entered into a magistrate’s head ; and they carried off multitudes from the establishment, the ministers of which comforted themselves with the sagacious remark, that “although they might entice

¹ Statutes at Large, 21 Geo. II. cap. xxxiv. vol. viii. p. 125.

² Culloden Papers, p. 289.

³ Cap. xxxiv. sect. 11.

of "deep piety, and manly sense." The primus could not officiate at this consecration, for reasons that are not stated; but he sent a commission to bishop White, who, with the assistance of bishops Falconar, Raitt, and Alexander, consecrated Mr. Gerard at Cupar in Fife on the 17th of July¹. As the law now stood no man could have witnessed this consecration but the parties engaged in it. It was done in secret, otherwise the "angry knuckles of the law" would at least have disturbed, if not entirely have prevented, this solemn action; nevertheless we have the neverfailing promise of God the Son, that "where two or three are gathered together in His name, there he will be in the midst of them."

IT IS STATED in the Scots Magazine for the next year that the Rev. George Sempell was arrested by some military for having been discovered officiating in a room in a private house in Perth to more than four persons. He was sentenced by the magistrates of Perth on the following day to be imprisoned for six months.

AN ACT of parliament was passed this year for uniting the two colleges of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, in the University of St. Andrews. In the body of this act we are informed that "his late majesty king William was graciously pleased, by a grant bearing date the 29th day of April, 1695, to grant to the said principals, professors, and masters in the said University of St. Andrews, and to their successors in office, the yearly sum of three hundred pounds out of the rents and revenues of the bishopricks of Scotland to continue in time coming, and to be paid yearly to the factors of the said colleges of the said university²." An act was also passed for taking away and abolishing the heretable jurisdictions in Scotland, and for restoring such jurisdictions to the crown; and for making more effectual provision for the administration of justice by the king's courts and judges there³.

1748.—AN ACT was passed in the summer of this year, to amend the act of 1746, which was calculated to complete the annihilation of the church. It was entitled, "An act to amend and enforce so much of an act made in the 19th year of his majesty's reign, as relates to the more effectual disarming the highlands in Scotland, and restraining the use of the

¹ Vindication, &c, 20-28.—Prim. Truth and Order, Appen. 522.—List, 39.—Keith, 333.—Skinner, ii. 670.—Perceval, 255.

² Statutes at Large, vol. vii. cap. xxxii. pp. 33, 34.

³ Ibid. cap. xliii. vol. vii. p. 61.

ghland dress ; and to masters and teachers of private schools and chaplains ; and to explain a clause in another act made in the same year, relating to letters of orders of episcopal ministers in Scotland, &c.”¹ The restraint on the dress of the highlanders was strongly opposed even by the friends of government, as being “no more than a chip in porridge,” and decidedly unjust to those clans that had not joined the invaders in 1745. The editor of the Culloden papers says, in note, “The English readers, and most of the Scotch, will be surprised to understand that the kilt or philabeg was *not* the ancient highland garb, but was introduced into the highlands about 1720, by one Thomas Rawlinson, an Englishman, who was overseer to a company carrying on iron works in Lengarry’s country. The convenience of the dress soon caused it to be universally adopted in the highlands².” The causes of this act with which we are concerned are those that arose on ecclesiastical affairs:—“And for the better ascertaining what shall be deemed exercising the employment, function, service, of a minister or chaplain, within the true intent and meaning of the said recited act [19th Geo. II.], be it enacted and declared, that from and after the 29th day of September, 1748, *any person* being or *pretending* to be in holy orders, *of any denomination WHATSOEVER*, other than the ministers, elders, or preachers of the established church of Scotland, who shall preach or perform any divine service in any house or family of which he is not the master, in the presence or hearing of any other person or persons, whether such person or persons be of the family or not, shall be deemed to be who exercises the employment, function, and service of a chaplain, within the provision and true intent and meaning of the same act³.”

IT IS EVIDENT from this clause of the act, that the *seceders* in the kirk were included in the prohibition to preach ; but the whole weight and violence of it fell *exclusively* upon the *holie* church of Scotland. No author that ever I have seen has noticed that *all denominations* whatsoever came within the meaning of the act which made it penal to preach in private persons. The seceders, however, escaped all penalties ; in fact, the idea of troubling them never once entered a magistrate’s head ; and they carried off multitudes from the establishment, the ministers of which comforted themselves with the sagacious remark, that “although they might entice

¹ Statutes at Large, 21 Geo. II. cap. xxxiv. vol. viii. p. 125.

² Culloden Papers, p. 289.

³ Cap. xxxiv. sect. 11.

away the people, yet they could not carry on *the stipend*." The next section subjected schoolmasters and teachers to the operation of this act, and to the penalties of imprisonment and transportation if they "attended divine worship in any episcopal meeting-house not allowed by law¹."

THAT THERE might be no mistake about the meaning of the act of 1746, the following clause explained and extended it:—
 "And whereas, by a clause in another act made in the 19th year of his majesty's reign, intituled, &c. . . . It is enacted, 'that from and after, &c. . . . no letters of orders of any pastor or minister of any episcopal meeting or congregation in Scotland, should be deemed sufficient, or *be admitted to be registered*, but such as have been given by some bishop of the church of England, or of Ireland; and in case any letters of orders, other than such as are before described, should be registered, *such registration* should be deemed *null and void* to all intents and purposes. And whereas, a doubt has been raised upon the said recited clause, whether the same doth extend to any letters of orders which have been registered before the said first day of September,' &c. . . . Now, for clearing and taking away any such doubt, it is hereby enacted and declared, by the authority aforesaid, that *no letter of orders* not granted by some bishop of the church of England or Ireland, shall, from and after the 29th day of Sept. 1748, be sufficient, or taken or adjudged to be sufficient, to qualify any such pastor or minister as above mentioned, whether the same were registered before or after the said first day of September, and that every such registration . . . shall, from and after the said 29th day of September, be deemed null and void to all intents and purposes²." But this was not all, for so anxious were the legislature to extirpate episcopacy, and leave not a wreck behind, that those treacherous hearers who should betray their spiritual fathers were exempted from the penalties which they themselves incurred by being present in any episcopal meeting-house. "And whereas, by another clause of the said act . . . there are penalties imposed on persons who shall resort to or frequent any episcopal meeting-house or congregation in Scotland, not allowed by law, who shall not, within the space of five days, give information of such illegal meeting to some magistrate. And whereas a doubt has been raised whether persons present at such illegal meeting, who did not within the space of five days give information thereof as aforesaid, could be compelled to appear and give evidence

¹ Section 12.

² Sect. 13.

against the minister or other person offending against the said act.' Be it therefore enacted and declared, by the authority foresaid, that in all prosecutions for offences against the said act, it shall and may be lawful and competent to produce as witnesses, whether against the minister or hearers, other persons present who may also have been guilty of offending against the said act; but the evidence given by such witnesses *shall not be made use of* or given in evidence *against themselves*, upon any prosecution for any penalty inflicted by the said act¹."

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs says, that from September, 1746, to the first of October, the clergy in Scotland continued their ministrations to the limited number of persons, and had to undergo the labour of officiating a great many times, on every Sunday, to different parties of *four persons*. But after the 1st of October, he says, "a new and severe act of parliament took place, whereby all the episcopal clergy were discharged from officiating *in any place* except their own dwelling-houses, and there to admit no more than four persons besides their families. This obliged the episcopal clergy to read prayers often every day; and this they continued for some considerable time, behaving themselves with all imaginable circumspection. Their quiet and peaceable conduct being known to those in power, who now were sensible that the informations given against the episcopal clergy, which had procured the two severe acts of parliament, had not been just, some of their friends thought they might venture to enlarge the number of them to whom they performed divine offices. Accordingly they took a little liberty, and enlarged their meetings; but fresh complaints being given in against them, not by the presbyterians, but by *false brethren*," the Independents, they were obliged to begin again to officiate to four persons only, "reading prayers, preaching the doctrines of christianity, and administering the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper; but no singing of psalms²."

ON THE FIFTH of December the reverends Alexander Greig of Stonehaven, John Petrie of Drumlithie, and John Troup of Muchalls, were tried before sheriff Young, at Stonehaven, for breaches of the late acts of parliament, in officiating to more than *four* persons at one time. As their trials shew the horrible state of persecution into which the church was then plunged, and the arts resorted to by the enemies of Christ and the church for her extirpation, I shall here extract the

¹ Sect. 21.

² MS. Memoirs, 57, 58.

evidence against these three confessors, from Mr. Anderson's interesting Narrative. Mr. Greig's case was first tried, and the following evidence was given:—

RICHARD SHAW, corporal in general Blakeney's regiment, deponed that on a Sunday in January last he went into a house in the south side of the High Street of Stonehaven, by order of lieutenant Mark Weeks, which he had often heard go under the name of a meeting-house, and had often seen people resorting to it on Sundays, as if for divine worship. When he went into the house there were convened in one room about forty persons, young and old, and in the same room there was a closet, in which he saw Mr. Greig standing in an episcopal habit, with a book in his hand, in which he was reading; and he heard him, in the [course of his] reading, several times make mention of St. Paul the Apostle. There were only two women with Mr. Greig in the closet, the door whereof was open to the room. The above forty persons did hear the said Mr. Greig at the time he was reading the book, and after being dismissed he saw them go to their several houses. Alexander Can and Richard Bridewell, soldiers of the same regiment, gave similar testimony; and that Mr. Greig wore a black gown with a band, and said to them it was his own room. William Cooper, a tailor, deponed that he had often seen "convened and met together, in the next room to Mr. Greig's, more than five persons over and above the household; which room was possessed by Jane Steven, for the purpose of hearing of Mr. Greig, who was in a closet within his own room. He did not see him, but he knew him to be the preacher by his voice; and those in Jane Steven's room made responses to him in the time of prayer. That he has heard Mr. Greig perform the whole of divine service after the form of the church of England, and he never heard him pray for his majesty by name, his heirs or successors, and all the royal family. That between the doors of the two rooms there was a plate, or basin, in which the persons convened put in offerings in money, intended for the use of Mr. Greig." Two other inhabitants of Stonehaven corroborated the foregoing evidence.

"THE PUBLIC prosecutor having declared his evidence, concluded by craving sentence against the pannel; and Mr. Greig craved *absolviter*, in respect that the whole witnesses were *socii criminis*, in so far as they were guilty of offences themselves on the statute libelled, as being undue hearers at the times and place libelled, which subjected them to the penalty of five pounds sterling, and consequently they were

gainers or losers by the cause; and that they did not inform within five days, and were there without his approbation or knowledge." "It having been answered by the Procurator Fiscal that these witnesses were not *socii criminis*, nor could gain or lose by the event of the cause, and that a witness cannot be cast unless he prove a crime against himself, which has not been done, although they were undue hearers, as asserted by Mr. Greig, which the procurator Fiscal knows nothing of, the sheriff found that they had all been competent witnesses, and continued the case." James Dickson in Kinmouth, James Campbell at Mill of Glenbervie, and Robert Murray at Stripends, gave similar evidence in the case of Mr. Petrie, of having officiated in his own house at Drumlithie. Mr. Petrie stated the same objections to the witnesses as Mr. Greig had done; but they were overruled. Three witnesses leponed to the same effect against Mr. Troup of Muchalls, who made the same defence as his two brethren had done, and with the same success¹.

MR. ANDERSON continues,—“We have been unable to discover any written evidence of the sentence pronounced against these gentlemen, but we have unquestionable authority for stating, that, during the winter of 1748-49, they were confined for the space of six months in the Tolbooth of Stonehaven, which was once used by the earl Marischal as a storehouse, and is situated on the north quay of the harbour. Here the sheriff held his courts, and the county gentlemen their meetings. The lower part of it is now converted into wine cellars, and the upper part into granaries. During the period of their confinement, they received every attention from their followers, ‘who contrived to convey plenty o’ a’ thing to them.’ Here they managed to perform the ceremony of baptism; and those who called on them frequently joined in divine service. But this being contrary to the jailor’s instructions, it, of course, could only be done, as it were, by stealth².” These three clergymen were confined in one cell, and were decided jacobites. Mr. Greig’s congregation assembled on the street, beneath the window of their common cell; to whom their pastor read the liturgy over the window, not only on Sundays but on the other days of the week. After divine service on week days, Mr. Troup entertained the audience, on the bagpipes, with the spirit-stirring jacobite tunes that, more than any other cause, kept up the national feeling in fa-

¹ Black Book of Kincardine.² Ibid.

your of the just hereditary line of our natural sovereigns¹. "We have not heard," says Mr. Anderson, "of more than two persons having been baptized by Mr. Greig, and none by Mr. Petrie; but Mr. Troup is supposed to have baptized a considerable number," during their imprisonment; "for the fishermen's wives from Skaterow were often to be seen trudging along the sea beach with their creels [baskets] on their backs, in which were carefully concealed the unconscious bantlings that were to be secretly presented to the baptismal font. After wading at the 'water yett' [gate] the conjoined streams of the Carron and Cowie, which could only be done on the reflux of the sea, they had to clamber a considerable distance, among rugged rocks, before reaching the back stair of the Tolbooth, where they had to watch a favourable opportunity of approaching the cell of their pastor. After the child was baptized, the mother again carefully depositing it in her creel, returned by the same route²." The late BISHOP JOLLY was baptized and instructed by this Mr. Greig, under all the persecution of the times. He always acknowledged himself much indebted, in the commencement and progress of his religious education, to the pastoral care and guidance of the rev. Alexander Greig, episcopal minister of his native place; whose memory, as I know personally, was long held in just and reverent respect in that quarter³."

THE INVASION of the united kingdom by a solitary claimant of the crown, to dispute its occupation with the powerful prince in full possession, and wielding all its civil and military resources, is perhaps one of the most extraordinary and romantic enterprises on record. He came, not to head a rebellion, but to claim the dutiful assistance and military service of his father's subjects, against a prince whom he and many others considered as an usurper. His expedition has been called a "wicked and unnatural rebellion:" but had it pleased God to have given him the victory, the law would have given his achievement another name. Those who followed his standard, and those who prayed for his success, did so from a sense of duty and the impulse of conscience; and whether or not this conscientious principle was right or wrong, it was followed by all the three religious bodies of the nation. The presbyterians who joined his standard acted on the just

¹ These were, the "White Cockade,"—"Highland Laddie,"—"O'er the Water to Charlie,"—"The Sow's Tail to Geordie,"—"Tulloch-gorum,"—"Kenmores Up and Awa," &c.—*Episcopal Magazine*, i. 152, 1833.

² *Black Book of Kincardine*.

³ *Bishop Walker's Life of Bishop Jolly*, p. 2.

and undoubted maxim of their own Confession of Faith,—that “infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate’s just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him; from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted¹.” The papists joined his standard upon their own principle—that none can be a lawful king without the pope’s sanction and authority; and the episcopalians, not having taken the oaths to the Hanoverian dynasty, did not think themselves prohibited from obeying the summons of him whom they were taught to consider their lawful sovereign; and the Revolution government had little claim to their gratitude. Charles did not appear as a rebel chief, but as the regent of him who was born heir to the crown, and who had been dispossessed of it by an invader, that came with a sufficient military force to prevent the stain of rebellion from attaching to his name. William came, unquestionably, to head a rebellion, and to *seize* a crown to which he had no claim, and he has been called a Deliverer; whereas Charles came to *recover* that of which his grandfather had been unjustly deprived by his own son-in-law, and the war that he declared against his rival has been called a “wicked and unnatural rebellion,” and a price was set upon his head. There was nothing either uncommon or unnatural in the exiled princes maintaining their claim to the British crown; dethroned princes, in all ages and in every country, have done the same. It would have been unnatural and spiritless if they had yielded up their birth-right without a struggle; for although it is now evident that God had given the kingdom to another, yet it was not then apparent, either to themselves or to their adherents. Besides, they had the examples in every country, but especially in their own, of the usurpation of the crown, and its recovery by the rightful heir, to stimulate them to measure swords with the possessor. Not to speak of their more remote ancestors, they were animated by the achievements of the illustrious Bruce; the struggles of Mary and her faithful adherents; of Charles the Martyr, and of the second Charles, to recover the crown, of which successful rebellion had for the time deprived all these princes. Then there were the many attempts of the house of York, to recover the crown of England from the usurpation of the house of Lancaster, which were at last successful.

CHARLES EDWARD was unsuccessful; hence his bold enterprise has been called a rebellion. Hence also he brought

¹ Cap. xxiii. sect. 4.

down the vengeance of a vindictive government, which had been most thoroughly frightened, not only on the families that had taken part in his enterprise, but on the church, which, *as a church*, took no part in it. The presbyterian persecutions had failed of their object to extirpate the church; but the persecution of a British parliament almost annihilated it. This enterprise, however, may convince the opponents of standing armies of the impolicy and folly of their opinions. When Charles was at Derby, the government were only *then collecting* an army to oppose him. Had he pushed on to the capital, he might have taken possession of it without opposition. But it was so ordered, that, instead of advancing, he retreated, and thus allowed his adversaries time to recover from their consternation. The battle of Falkirk shed a lustre over his arms; but from the moment that he sounded a retreat the hopes of his house were extinguished. Lord president Forbes says, after the battle of Preston-pans, “all jacobites, how prudent soever, became mad; all doubtful people became jacobites; and all bankrupts became heroes, and talked of nothing but hereditary rights and victory; and what was more grievous to men of gallantry, and, if you will believe me, much more mischievous to the public, all the fine ladies, if you will except one or two, became passionately fond of the young adventurer, and used all their arts and industry for him in the most intemperate manner¹.”

THE SACRILEGE committed by the duke of Cumberland is disgraceful to his memory and to the history of a civilised country. His cruelties to the unfortunate highlanders will ever make his name to be execrated among their descendants. One of the objects that government had in view in sending him to Scotland, was to conciliate the people, and to familiarise them to a prince of the blood; but his conduct had a contrary effect, and the dislike which he excited long attached to the dynasty. The whole kingdom was subjected to military law, and he proved stern and unrelenting in the execution of it in the highlands. But, says Mr. Skinner, who was himself a sufferer, “in such places as were at any distance from that unhappy neighbourhood, the necessary orders against suspected persons, though grievous enough, in the meantime, to the miserable sufferers, were executed, for the most part, with a humanity which did honour to the feelings of those concerned in the execution, and to which the cool moments of reflection will give its due praise. In this state of anxious sus-

¹ Culloden Papers, p. 250.

sense stood our ecclesiastical matters, till, upon a gradual return of civil administration, the law began to take notice of us, and to provide more efficaciously in time coming against these dangers, of which our enemies now took the handle to charge our church with having been the occasion." But the persecution to which the church was subjected, extended to the laity as well as to the clergy:—"Hitherto, our laity, of whatever rank or character, high or low, had met with no legal molestation, nor been subjected to any penalty, on account of their religious profession; and many conspicuous names, of eminence and repute in the several departments of the administration, and well enough affected to the public government, had attended our communion, without inward scruple or outward offence." The persecuting clause of the act of this year "passed in the House of Commons without any great struggle; but in the House of Lords it met with a different reception. In the committee, it was opposed by all the bishops unanimously, as well as by several lay lords; and on the question being put, it was *thrown out* by 32 against 28; but upon the report, a new debate ensued, and on a division it was *placed* by 37 against 32. The bishops not only pointed out the manifest injustice of this new explanation with great force of reasoning, but likewise expressed themselves not thoroughly pleased with the clause in its original construction, bordering too near upon the rights of ordination, which, they said, was a matter not of parliamentary but ecclesiastical cognizance, and was inherent in the episcopal character; which they acknowledged the non-juring bishops of Scotland bore, though not legally, yet primitively clothed with. But the chancellor Hardwicke, who, if not an enemy to, was indifferent about, episcopacy of any kind, being supported, too, by all the Scottish peers except the earl of Murray, had interest enough to form a majority against the bishops, and to get the clause passed as it stands¹."

THE PERSECUTING act of 1746 had given liberty to four persons besides the family of any house, whether it was the clergyman's own house or any other; but the amended act removed even this small indulgence, and confined peremptorily the clergy's ministrations to their *own house*, and to none other. By the last severe and antichristian statute, says bishop Russell, "the complying clergymen were subjected to the very same persecution which those endured who refused to take the oaths and to name the sovereign in their prayers.

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History. ii. 668.

Some of them were imprisoned, others sought shelter by crossing the Tweed; while a great number left their native country altogether, and endeavoured to find freedom of worship, and the means of supporting their families, in the colonies of North America.

“THERE IS NOT to be found, in any protestant nation, an example of penal laws at once so oppressive and insidious as those of which the history has now been described. A resolution was thereby avowed *to extirpate a whole communion*, by rendering their worship illegal, and by depriving them of all the political privileges which are most highly valued in a free country. In less enlightened times, when death was made the punishment of an erring faith, public sympathy was in general so much excited that the bloodiest statutes were soon reduced to a dead letter. . . . The sight of a martyr standing amidst the faggots which are about to consume his living flesh, creates deep thoughts and serious reflections in all who witness his constancy But who compassionated the *unseen prisoner* and the *weary exile*? Who traced the steps or the sufferings of him who was chased from the scene of his christian labours, saw his chapel closed, his flock scattered, his person reviled, and the sources of an honest independence dried up? Law pursued him in the form of starvation and contempt; marking him as one excluded from the benefits of civil society, deprived of political rights himself, and carrying a similar disqualification to others. Even his meek resignation and unresisting principles exposed him to neglect; for had he, like the covenanter, taken the field and sounded the note of war, he would have assumed a more interesting attitude in the public eye, and his death on the scaffold would, at least, have thrown a deeper odium on an illiberal government.

“THE PRIVATIONS which the Scottish episcopalians were doomed to endure are recorded no where except in those private histories the materials of which belong to biography rather than to a general narrative. All appearance of public worship was necessarily avoided, and the clergy had recourse to a method, practised by them before they enjoyed toleration, of visiting families in private, where a few faithful followers met to celebrate the rites of their church in the utmost secrecy. Sometimes they had little chapels, if such they might be called, in the recesses of narrow streets or alleys, where they convened the more resolute of their adherents with caution, and by stealth. Frequently these secluded places of worship were in the lofts of ruined stables and cow-houses, and were

ly approachable by moveable ladders, placed under the charge of some vigilant friend ; and at one time the existence of such retreats was carefully concealed, except from those on whom the greatest reliance could be reposed. At the present day, the traveller in one part of Scotland may visit the wild caves in which the heroes of the Covenant shunned the pursuit of Claverhouse and Dalzell ; and in another, especially in the towns beyond the Forth, he may see the rude garrets and antiquated apartments, wherein, during their period of dejection, they went to assemble a few concealed worshippers belonging to the Scottish episcopal church. For the latter, no Indulgence appeared, and to them no terms of accommodation were ever held out ; and the fact that their communion was not utterly extinguished before forty-two years of such darkness passed away, can only be ascribed to the power of principle co-operating with the sense of duty¹."

¹ Bishop Russell's History of the Church in Scotland, 404-406.

CHAPTER LXXI.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. ROBERT KEITH,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1749.—Rev. Mr. Greig and others released from prison.—1750.—Number of the clergy—their gradual decrease.—A baptism by a river's side.—Moravians.—1751.—Amount of the parochial livings—attempt to increase them unsuccessful.—Determined opposition of the landowners.—1752.—The secession—their Testimony.—Secession from the secession.—The associate synod.—The burgess' oath—debates upon it.—The relief synod.—State in which the church was placed by the penal statutes.—Letter from a clergyman.—Charles's alleged abjuration.—1753.—Effects and hardship of the penal statutes.—Rev. John Skinner—committed to gaol—his employment there.—1754.—Effects of persecution on the laity.—Marriages. — INDEPENDENTS—their rise.—1755.—Rev. James Connachar's case—apprehended—his trial—the pleadings, &c.—banished—his regret.—Letter to bishop Keith.—1756.—Rev. Walter Stewart—trial—imprisonment. — 1757. — Death of bishop Keith.—Remarks on the state of the church—a remnant left.—Sinful state of the nation.

1749.—AFTER AN imprisonment of six months, Messrs. Greig of Stonehaven, Petrie of Drumlithie, and Troup of Muchalls, were set at liberty in due course of law. “They returned to their respective abodes, and preached to their followers in private houses¹.” At this point of depression, and “under all these dangers and difficulties, the bishops took particular care of what was peculiarly entrusted to them—the continuance of the episcopal succession; without which, they knew a church could not long subsist, though the hand of oppression was not bearing it down. Yet, with all their care and attention, the woeful effects of the late penal laws began by degrees to be felt. Many of the older clergy were called off by death, and such young men as had been preparing themselves for the service of the church, being affrighted at the discouraging prospects before them, or wrought upon by the

¹ Black Book of Kincardineshire.

timorous caution of their friends, turned their thoughts another way, and either went abroad, or retired to some secular business at home. The gentry, too, of our communion, who, by birth or fortune, were entitled to be useful and make a figure in the state, finding their legal privileges struck at by the disqualifying act of 1746, stood aloof, in many places, from our worship; and not inclining, or not having sufficient conviction of its spiritual authority to join the establishment, *appeared in no place of worship whatever*—has contributed not a little to that spirit of *irreligion* and disregard for sacred things, now so much and so greatly complained of¹.”

1750.—THE ATTEMPT, says bishop Walker, “to restore the exiled family, in 1715, put an end to the toleration, and exposed the episcopal clergy again to much inconvenience and annoyance; but in 1740 they yet amounted to about *three hundred*, and had numerous and respectable congregations. This fact proves, I think, very decidedly, that the episcopal church was not so contrary to the inclination of the people, nor by the majority of them considered such a grievance as it has been the practice generally to maintain. Indeed, if episcopal principles and predilections had not had a stronger hold on the country than the current of opinion allows, they would scarcely, I think, in any shape have survived the restrictions imposed in 1716, and certainly not to such an extent. . . . That any religious community should have suffered in this country, as our poor church suffered during the last century, appears now almost incredible and unaccountable. I know I shall be met with the case of the Covenanters in the century before; *but they were in arms* against the government, while our clergy were unarmed, unobtrusive, and unresisting. The acts of 1746 and 1748, against our church, did not profess to punish any overt acts of sedition or of treason, but *proscribed effect* amongst us, that system of religion which was established in the largest part of the empire. An episcopal clergyman was prohibited from officiating to more than four persons besides his own family, and any person, a freeholder, who attended such twice in one year, *forfeited ALL his political privileges*. The bishops Sherlock of London, Secker, then of Oxford, and Maddox of Worcester, opposed these enactments, and with great force, maintaining that their only object would probably be the destruction of religion in a considerable part of the community, whom no act of parliament can compel to attend another church, and whom yet these acts

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 671.

will not allow to attend their own. That our church should have survived such enactments in any shape, proves, I repeat, that episcopacy had a *stronger hold* in the country than is generally supposed. The clergy were subjected to the penalty of six months' imprisonment for the first offence, and banishment for the second. Many were, in consequence, *absolutely silenced*. Many did duty, on the same Sunday, *sixteen several times*, keeping so far as might be within the law¹."

THE BRANCH of the catholic church which still existed in Scotland, was yearly becoming more and more invisible. Both priests and people were now involved in the same dangers and in the same penalties, and it was with the greatest difficulty, and with the utmost privacy, that the sacraments could be administered. Bishop Walker again supplies us with an instance, out of many, of the privacy with which the holy sacrament of baptism was often administered.—"In the register of the episcopal chapel of Muthill, in Perthshire, which commenced in the year 1697, there is, in the hand-writing of the rev. William Erskine, minister from 1734 to 1783, the following entry, under date 20th of March, 1750:—'N.B. With such *excessive severity* were the penal laws executed at this time, that Andrew Moir, having neglected to keep his appointment with me at my own house this morning, and following me to lord Rollo's house, of Duncrub, we could *not take the child into a house*; but I was obliged to go under the *cover of the trees* in one of lord Rollo's parks, to prevent our being discovered, and baptize the child there²!' In poverty and deep depression, a small remnant of the clergy still exerted themselves, at every risk, to preserve the church committed to them." This baptism resembled those of the primitive christians, when a convert said,—“See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?”

IT SEEMS that two deputies from the Moravians arrived this year at Inverary, the county town of Argyleshire, and surveyed the country in the neighbourhood, for the purpose of selecting a proper place for settling a colony of their body. It is probable they had not proceeded any farther in their design. for there is no farther account of them³.

1751.—THE WEALTH of the episcopal church of Scotland before the Revolution may be gathered from the following scheme of the livings of the establishment at this time, which were so miserably small that the different synods and presby-

¹ Note A. to a Charge delivered on 3d July, 1832, pp. 36-38.

² Ibid. p. 38.

³ Gentleman's Magazine, vol. xx. p. 525.

s made a determined effort to increase them by an application to parliament. The whole body of the tithe-holders in instant alarm, and public meetings were held in every county, to organise the most strenuous opposition. In Aberdeenshire, Arthur Forbes, of Echt, who had formerly been an instrument of the presbyteries in persecuting the church, now turned round on his old friends, and presided at a county meeting, which adopted hostile resolutions; one of which stated, “an application for bringing any additional burden upon the landed interest would set the clergy in that line the malice of their worst enemies and ours have always succeeded to place them, and might have an unhappy influence on the affections of the people, and, of consequence, be hurtful to religion itself¹.” Here the *spirit of sacrifice* was predominant. With all their pretensions to religious zeal, the *affections* of the heritors (for with the direct payment of tithes the body of the people have nothing to do) were set on to withhold the tithes which their ancestors had given to the church, from that party which was now *legally* entitled to receive them. The scheme of the ministers was frustrated, and they were made to feel that “the inclinations of the people” were not so much in favour of presbytery as they had set on *robbing God of what had been solemnly given to*

A committee of the Assembly reported, that in return for letters and queries sent to presbyteries, they had received statistics and other facts respecting 833 benefices; of these, separating what is allowed for communion elements, were in the establishment—

1 living, under £25.					
8	above	£25	but not exceeding		£30.
12	30	35
25	35	40
106	40	45
126	45	50
84	...	50	55
119	55	60
94	60	65
119	65	70
38	70	75
27	75	80
22	80	85
7	85	90
9	90	95

¹ Scots Magazine, xii. p. 50.

your of the just hereditary line of our natural sovereigns¹. “We have not heard,” says Mr. Anderson, “of more than two persons having been baptized by Mr. Greig, and none by Mr. Petrie; but Mr. Troup is supposed to have baptized a considerable number,” during their imprisonment; “for the fishermen’s wives from Skaterow were often to be seen trudging along the sea beach with their creels [baskets] on their backs, in which were carefully concealed the unconscious bantlings that were to be secretly presented to the baptismal font. After wading at the ‘water yett’ [gate] the conjoined streams of the Carron and Cowie, which could only be done on the reflux of the sea, they had to clamber a considerable distance, among rugged rocks, before reaching the back stair of the Tolbooth, where they had to watch a favourable opportunity of approaching the cell of their pastor. After the child was baptized, the mother again carefully depositing it in her creel, returned by the same route².” The late BISHOP JOLLY was baptized and instructed by this Mr. Greig, under all the persecution of the times. He always acknowledged himself much indebted, in the commencement and progress of his religious education, to the pastoral care and guidance of the rev. Alexander Greig, episcopal minister of his native place; whose memory, as I know personally, was long held in just and reverent respect in that quarter³.”

THE INVASION of the united kingdom by a solitary claimant of the crown, to dispute its occupation with the powerful prince in full possession, and wielding all its civil and military resources, is perhaps one of the most extraordinary and romantic enterprises on record. He came, not to head a rebellion, but to claim the dutiful assistance and military service of his father’s subjects, against a prince whom he and many others considered as an usurper. His expedition has been called a “wicked and unnatural rebellion:” but had it pleased God to have given him the victory, the law would have given his achievement another name. Those who followed his standard, and those who prayed for his success, did so from a sense of duty and the impulse of conscience; and whether or not this conscientious principle was right or wrong, it was followed by all the three religious bodies of the nation. The presbyterians who joined his standard acted on the just

¹ These were, the “White Cockade,”—“Highland Laddie,”—“O’er the Water to Charlie,”—“The Sow’s Tail to Geordie,”—“Tulloch-gorum,”—“Kenmores Up and Awa,” &c.—*Episcopal Magazine*, i. 152, 1833.

² *Black Book of Kincardine.* ³ *Bishop Walker’s Life of Bishop Jolly*, p. 2.

and undoubted maxim of their own Confession of Faith,—that “infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate’s just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him; from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted¹.” The papists joined his standard upon their own principle—that none can be a lawful king without the pope’s sanction and authority; and the episcopalians, not having taken the oaths to the Hanoverian dynasty, did not think themselves prohibited from obeying the summons of him whom they were taught to consider their lawful sovereign; and the Revolution government had little claim to their gratitude. Charles did not appear as a rebel chief, but as the regent of him who was born heir to the crown, and who had been dispossessed of it by an invader, that came with a sufficient military force to prevent the stain of rebellion from attaching to his name. William came, unquestionably, to head a rebellion, and to *seize* a crown to which he had no claim, and he has been called a Deliverer; whereas Charles came to *recover* that of which his grandfather had been unjustly deprived by his own son-in-law, and the war that he declared against his rival has been called a “wicked and unnatural rebellion,” and a price was set upon his head. There was nothing either uncommon or unnatural in the deposed princes maintaining their claim to the British crown; deposed princes, in all ages and in every country, have done the same. It would have been unnatural and spiritless if they had yielded up their birth-right without a struggle; for although it is now evident that God had given the kingdom to another, yet it was not then apparent, either to themselves or their adherents. Besides, they had the examples in every country, but especially in their own, of the usurpation of the crown, and its recovery by the rightful heir, to stimulate them to measure swords with the possessor. Not to speak of their more remote ancestors, they were animated by the achievements of the illustrious Bruce; the struggles of Mary and her faithful adherents; of Charles the Martyr, and of the second Charles, to recover the crown, of which successful rebellion had for the time deprived all these princes. Then there were the many attempts of the house of York, to recover the crown of England from the usurpation of the house of Lancaster, which were at last successful.

CHARLES EDWARD was unsuccessful; hence his bold enterprise has been called a rebellion. Hence also he brought

¹ Cap. xxiii. sect. 4.

down the vengeance of a vindictive government, which had been most thoroughly frightened, not only on the families that had taken part in his enterprise, but on the church, which, *as a church*, took no part in it. The presbyterian persecutions had failed of their object to extirpate the church; but the persecution of a British parliament almost annihilated it. This enterprise, however, may convince the opponents of standing armies of the impolicy and folly of their opinions. When Charles was at Derby, the government were only *then collecting* an army to oppose him. Had he pushed on to the capital, he might have taken possession of it without opposition. But it was so ordered, that, instead of advancing, he retreated, and thus allowed his adversaries time to recover from their consternation. The battle of Falkirk shed a lustre over his arms; but from the moment that he sounded a retreat the hopes of his house were extinguished. Lord president Forbes says, after the battle of Preston-pans, “all jacobites, how prudent soever, became mad; all doubtful people became jacobites; and all bankrupts became heroes, and talked of nothing but hereditary rights and victory; and what was more grievous to men of gallantry, and, if you will believe me, much more mischievous to the public, all the fine ladies, if you will except one or two, became passionately fond of the young adventurer, and used all their arts and industry for him in the most intemperate manner¹.”

THE SACRILEGE committed by the duke of Cumberland is disgraceful to his memory and to the history of a civilised country. His cruelties to the unfortunate highlanders will ever make his name to be execrated among their descendants. One of the objects that government had in view in sending him to Scotland, was to conciliate the people, and to familiarise them to a prince of the blood; but his conduct had a contrary effect, and the dislike which he excited long attached to the dynasty. The whole kingdom was subjected to military law, and he proved stern and unrelenting in the execution of it in the highlands. But, says Mr. Skinner, who was himself a sufferer, “in such places as were at any distance from that unhappy neighbourhood, the necessary orders against suspected persons, though grievous enough, in the meantime, to the miserable sufferers, were executed, for the most part, with a humanity which did honour to the feelings of those concerned in the execution, and to which the cool moments of reflection will give its due praise. In this state of anxious sus-

¹ Culloden Papers, p. 250.

pense stood our ecclesiastical matters, till, upon a gradual return of civil administration, the law began to take notice of us, and to provide more efficaciously in time coming against these dangers, of which our enemies now took the handle to charge our church with having been the occasion." But the persecution to which the church was subjected, extended to the laity as well as to the clergy:—"Hitherto, our laity, of whatever rank or character, high or low, had met with no legal molestation, nor been subjected to any penalty, on account of their religious profession; and many conspicuous names, of eminence and repute in the several departments of the administration, and well enough affected to the public government, had attended our communion, without inward scruple or outward offence." The persecuting clause of the act of this year "passed in the House of Commons without any great struggle; but in the House of Lords it met with a different reception. In the committee, it was opposed by all the bishops unanimously, as well as by several lay lords; and on the question being put, it was *thrown out* by 32 against 28; but upon the report, a new debate ensued, and on a division it was *replaced* by 37 against 32. The bishops not only pointed out the manifest injustice of this new explanation with great force of reasoning, but likewise expressed themselves not thoroughly pleased with the clause in its original construction, as bordering too near upon the rights of ordination, which, they said, was a matter not of parliamentary but ecclesiastical cognizance, and was inherent in the episcopal character; which they acknowledged the non-juring bishops of Scotland were, though not legally, yet primitively clothed with. But the chancellor Hardwicke, who, if not an enemy to, was indifferent about, episcopacy of any kind, being supported, too, by all the Scottish peers except the earl of Murray, had interest enough to form a majority against the bishops, and to get the clause passed as it stands¹."

THE PERSECUTING act of 1746 had given liberty to four worshippers besides the family of any house, whether it was the clergyman's own house or any other; but the amended act removed even this small indulgence, and confined peremptorily the clergy's ministrations to their *own house*, and to none other. By the last severe and antichristian statute, says bishop Russell, "the complying clergymen were subjected to the very same persecution which those endured who refused to take the oaths and to name the sovereign in their prayers.

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History. ii. 668.

Some of them were imprisoned, others sought shelter by crossing the Tweed; while a great number left their native country altogether, and endeavoured to find freedom of worship, and the means of supporting their families, in the colonies of North America.

“THERE IS NOT to be found, in any protestant nation, an example of penal laws at once so oppressive and insidious as those of which the history has now been described. A resolution was thereby avowed *to extirpate a whole communion*, by rendering their worship illegal, and by depriving them of all the political privileges which are most highly valued in a free country. In less enlightened times, when death was made the punishment of an erring faith, public sympathy was in general so much excited that the bloodiest statutes were soon reduced to a dead letter. . . . The sight of a martyr standing amidst the faggots which are about to consume his living flesh, creates deep thoughts and serious reflections in all who witness his constancy But who compassionated the *unseen prisoner* and the *weary exile*? Who traced the steps or the sufferings of him who was chased from the scene of his christian labours, saw his chapel closed, his flock scattered, his person reviled, and the sources of a honest independence dried up? Law pursued him in the form of starvation and contempt; marking him as one excluded from the benefits of civil society, deprived of political rights himself, and carrying a similar disqualification to others. Even his meek resignation and unresisting principles exposed him to neglect; for had he, like the covenanter, taken the field and sounded the note of war, he would have assumed a more interesting attitude in the public eye, and his death on the scaffold would, at least, have thrown a deeper odium on an illiberal government.

“THE PRIVATIONS which the Scottish episcopalians were doomed to endure are recorded nowhere except in those private histories the materials of which belong to biography rather than to a general narrative. All appearance of public worship was necessarily avoided, and the clergy had recourse to a method, practised by them before they enjoyed toleration of visiting families in private, where a few faithful followers met to celebrate the rites of their church in the utmost secrecy. Sometimes they had little chapels, if such they might be called, in the recesses of narrow streets or alleys, where they convened the more resolute of their adherents with caution and by stealth. Frequently these secluded places of worship were in the lofts of ruined stables and cow-houses, and were

only approachable by moveable ladders, placed under the charge of some vigilant friend ; and at one time the existence of such retreats was carefully concealed, except from those on whom the greatest reliance could be reposed. At the present day, the traveller in one part of Scotland may visit the wild caves in which the heroes of the Covenant shunned the pursuit of Claverhouse and Dalzell ; and in another, especially in the towns beyond the Forth, he may see the rude garrets and antiquated apartments, wherein, during their period of dejection, were wont to assemble a few concealed worshippers belonging to the Scottish episcopal church. For the latter, no Indulgence appeared, and to them no terms of accommodation were ever held out ; and the fact that their communion was not utterly extinguished before forty-two years of such darkness passed away, can only be ascribed to the power of principle co-operating with the sense of duty¹."

¹ Bishop Russell's History of the Church in Scotland, 404-406.

CHAPTER LXXI.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. ROBERT KEITH,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1749.—Rev. Mr. Greig and others released from prison.—1750.—Number of the clergy—their gradual decrease.—A baptism by a river's side.—Moravians.—1751.—Amount of the parochial livings—attempt to increase them unsuccessful.—Determined opposition of the landowners.—1752.—The secession—their Testimony.—Secession from the secession.—The associate synod.—The burgess' oath—debates upon it.—The relief synod.—State in which the church was placed by the penal statutes.—Letter from a clergyman.—Charles's alleged abjuration.—1753.—Effects and hardship of the penal statutes.—Rev. John Skinner—committed to gaol—his employment there.—1754.—Effects of persecution on the laity.—Marriages.—INDEPENDENTS—their rise.—1755.—Rev. James Connachar's case—apprehended—his trial—the pleadings, &c.—banished—his regret.—Letter to bishop Keith.—1756.—Rev. Walter Stewart—trial—imprisonment.—1757.—Death of bishop Keith.—Remarks on the state of the church—a remnant left.—Sinful state of the nation.

1749.—AFTER AN imprisonment of six months, Messrs. Greig of Stonehaven, Petrie of Drumlithie, and Troup of Muchalls, were set at liberty in due course of law. "They returned to their respective abodes, and preached to their followers in private houses¹." At this point of depression, and "under all these dangers and difficulties, the bishops took particular care of what was peculiarly entrusted to them—the continuance of the episcopal succession; without which, they knew a church could not long subsist, though the hand of oppression was not bearing it down. Yet, with all their care and attention, the woeful effects of the late penal laws began by degrees to be felt. Many of the older clergy were called off by death, and such young men as had been preparing themselves for the service of the church, being affrighted at the discouraging prospects before them, or wrought upon by the

¹ Black Book of Kincardineshire.

timorous caution of their friends, turned their thoughts another way, and either went abroad, or retired to some secular business at home. The gentry, too, of our communion, who, by birth or fortune, were entitled to be useful and make a figure in the state, finding their legal privileges struck at by the disqualifying act of 1746, stood aloof, in many places, from our worship; and not inclining, or not having sufficient conviction of its spiritual authority to join the establishment, *appeared in no place of worship whatever*—has contributed not a little to that spirit of *irreligion* and disregard for sacred things, now so much and so greatly complained of¹.”

1750.—THE ATTEMPT, says bishop Walker, “to restore the exiled family, in 1715, put an end to the toleration, and exposed the episcopal clergy again to much inconvenience and annoyance; but in 1740 they yet amounted to about *three hundred*, and had numerous and respectable congregations. This fact proves, I think, very decidedly, that the episcopal church was not so contrary to the inclination of the people, or by the majority of them considered such a grievance as it has been the practice generally to maintain. Indeed, if episcopal principles and predilections had not had a stronger hold in the country than the current of opinion allows, they would scarcely, I think, in any shape have survived the restrictions imposed in 1716, and certainly not to such an extent. . . . That any religious community should have suffered in this country, as our poor church suffered during the last century, appears now almost incredible and unaccountable. I know what shall be met with the case of the Covenanters in the century before; *but they were in arms* against the government, while our clergy were unarmed, unobtrusive, and unresisting. The acts of 1746 and 1748, against our church, did not profess to punish any overt acts of sedition or of treason, but *proscribed effect* amongst us, that system of religion which was established in the largest part of the empire. An episcopal clergyman was prohibited from officiating to more than four persons besides his own family, and any person, a freeholder, who attended such twice in one year, *forfeited ALL his political privileges*. The bishops Sherlock of London, Secker, then of Oxford, and Maddox of Worcester, opposed these enactments, and with great force, maintaining that their only object would probably be the destruction of religion in a considerable part of the community, whom no act of parliament can compel to attend another church, and whom yet these acts

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 671.

will not allow to attend their own. That our church should have survived such enactments in any shape, proves, I repeat, that episcopacy had a *stronger hold* in the country than is generally supposed. The clergy were subjected to the penalty of six months' imprisonment for the first offence, and banishment for the second. Many were, in consequence, *absolutely silenced*. Many did duty, on the same Sunday, *sixteen several times*, keeping so far as might be within the law¹."

THE BRANCH of the catholic church which still existed in Scotland, was yearly becoming more and more invisible. Both priests and people were now involved in the same dangers and in the same penalties, and it was with the greatest difficulty, and with the utmost privacy, that the sacraments could be administered. Bishop Walker again supplies us with an instance, out of many, of the privacy with which the holy sacrament of baptism was often administered.—"In the register of the episcopal chapel of Muthill, in Perthshire, which commenced in the year 1697, there is, in the hand-writing of the rev. William Erskine, minister from 1734 to 1783, the following entry, under date 20th of March, 1750:—'N.B. With such *excessive severity* were the penal laws executed at this time, that Andrew Moir, having neglected to keep his appointment with me at my own house this morning, and following me to lord Rollo's house, of Duncrub, we could *not take the child into a house*; but I was obliged to go under the *cover of the trees* in one of lord Rollo's parks, to prevent our being discovered, and baptize the child there²!' In poverty and deep depression, a small remnant of the clergy still exerted themselves, at every risk, to preserve the church committed to them." This baptism resembled those of the primitive christians, when a convert said,—"See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?"

IT SEEMS that two deputies from the Moravians arrived this year at Inverary, the county town of Argyleshire, and surveyed the country in the neighbourhood, for the purpose of selecting a proper place for settling a colony of their body. It is probable they had not proceeded any farther in their design. for there is no farther account of them³.

1751.—THE WEALTH of the episcopal church of Scotland before the Revolution may be gathered from the following scheme of the livings of the establishment at this time, which were so miserably small that the different synods and presby-

¹ Note A. to a Charge delivered on 3d July, 1832, pp. 36-38.

² Ibid. p. 38.

³ Gentleman's Magazine, vol. xx. p. 525.

made a determined effort to increase them by an application to parliament. The whole body of the tithe-holders in constant alarm, and public meetings were held in every parish, to organise the most strenuous opposition. In Aberdeen, Arthur Forbes, of Echt, who had formerly been an instrument of the presbyteries in persecuting the church, now turned round on his old friends, and presided at a synod meeting, which adopted hostile resolutions; one of which stated, “an application for bringing any additional burden upon the landed interest would set the clergy in that line with the malice of their worst enemies and ours have always been ready to place them, and might have an unhappy influence upon the affections of the people, and, of consequence, be hurtful to religion itself¹.” Here the *spirit of sacrifice* was predominant. With all their pretensions to religious zeal, the heritors (for with the direct payment of the tithe the body of the people have nothing to do) were set upon to withhold the tithes which their ancestors had given to the church, from that party which was now *legally* bound to receive them. The scheme of the ministers was exposed, and they were made to feel that “the inclinations of the people” were not so much in favour of presbytery as they set on *robbing God of what had been solemnly given to*

A committee of the Assembly reported, that in return for answers and queries sent to presbyteries, they had received the following facts respecting 833 benefices; of these, separating what is allowed for communion elements, there were in the establishment—

1 living, under £25.					
8	above	£25	but not exceeding		£30.
12	30	35
25	35	40
106	40	45
126	45	50
84	...	50	55
119	55	60
94	60	65
119	65	70
38	70	75
27	75	80
22	80	85
7	85	90
9	90	95

¹ Scots Magazine, xii. p. 50.

12	above	£95	but not exceeding £100		
8	100	105
2	105	110
8	110	115
16	of	138	17s. 9½d.		

and that the whole of these benefices, deducting what is upon the whole allowed for communion elements, is £50,266 15s. 5½d.; and in these there are stipends included that are not paid out of the tithes. It is to be observed, also, that 65 livings are under the then legal *minimum* of 800 merks, or £44 8s. 10½d. sterling, and 182 have no allowance for communion elements. About 700 kirks had glebes, and the committee proposed to the Assembly that the *minimum* of stipends should be raised to “ten chaldrons of victual, or its value, according to the usual conversions, together with as much money as to make up the whole stipend to £1000 Scots, or £83 6s. 8d. sterling.” The committee gave it as their opinion to the General Assembly, that they should make immediate application to parliament, for the purpose above set forth, the first session thereof that shall be held after the meeting of this Assembly¹.

THE HERITORS made a most determined opposition to this augmentation of the stipends, and they took an extraordinary method of defeating the views of the ministers. The presbyteries had paid very little attention to the provisions of the act that restored patronages; for, “in direct disobedience to it, they frequently *refused* to enter their patron’s presentee, and, for the most part moderated the call of another person, named to them by the christian people, as they are called—the heritors or the elders.” The Scottish members circulated a paper amongst the members of the House of Commons, stating the above allegation, and added—“It is therefore submitted, that as a great part of the persons that now apply to parliament for relief with respect to their stipends, became entitled to them in breach or opposition to a law made by the parliament of Great Britain, that in case the wisdom of parliament shall incline to indulge the clergy with any alteration of the laws as to these matters, they will at the same time make effectual provision for enforcing a due obedience to the act 10th of Queen Anne, in such manner as that it should not be in the power of the presbyteries of Scotland to elude the same in the manner they have hitherto done².” On the

¹ Minutes of Assembly, cited in Scots Magazine, xii. 203, 204.

² Scots Magazine, viii. pp 329, 330.

22d of June, the commissioners that had been sent up by the Assembly to watch the progress of their application to parliament, returned home, having entirely failed in procuring any augmentation to their small stipends, chiefly through the opposition of the owners of land, who are the immediate tithe-payers in their own country¹.

1752.—EVER SINCE the presbyterian party had become firmly established, their history has been extremely uninteresting; it is chiefly a repetition of the forcible settlements of ministers in the different parishes, by means of “riding committees” and military parties. The commission of Assembly had suspended the four seceding brethren, already mentioned, from the exercise of all the parts of the ministerial function; but against this suspension the seceders entered their protest. Subsequently the four brethren, with some others who had joined them, were “loosed from their relation” to their congregations, and their churches were declared vacant. Willison says, “As the judicatories at this time seemed to act with much *heat and severity*, in order to support and screw up their authority, so we must own that the four brethren seemed to shew *no little honour and stiffness* in opposing their authority and despising their sentences; for they would give no ear to their friends who dealt with them to shew some subjection to the judicatories, as to their fathers and superiors; and although they were just now abusing their church power, and unwarrantably provoking their children, yet some regard is to be shewn to their authority even when so doing².” The brethren were now increased by new adhesions; and they protested, that notwithstanding this sentence of the commission, “their pastoral relation to their former flocks should be held and reputed by them firm and valid.” In conclusion, they protested that “they were obliged *to make a SECESSION* from” the establishment; “that they could have no ministerial communion with them till they see their sins and mistakes, and amend them.” The seceding brethren constituted themselves into a separate presbytery in 1733, under the denomination of the ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERY, as already mentioned³. The following year they published a Testimony, in which they said, “we have made a secession from the prevailing *party*, who are carrying on the course of defection; but our secession is not from the church of Scotland. We own her doctrine, contained in her Confession of Faith; we observe the

¹ Gentleman's Mag. xxi. p. 282. ² Testimony, 78, 79.

³ Ch. lxvi. p. 268.

received and approved uniformity of worship; we adhere unto her presbyterian government and discipline, according to the word of God and our solemn covenant engagements; and we have not been convicted of any thing in doctrine or practice to the contrary."

A DOOR was opened by the Assembly of 1774 for the re-admission of the seceders, by the repeal of several obnoxious acts of assembly; but by this time the seceders had felt their own strength, and therefore declined to return to the establishment, alleging, that although they allowed that *some* parts of the grounds of their secession had been removed, yet they found the *principal* ground not only remaining, but aggravated. Mr. M'Millan and Mr. Nairne seceded from the seceders on political grounds, affirming that none but a covenanted presbyterian could be the lawful sovereign of this realm. These two, therefore, separated, and constituted the REFORMED PRESBYTERY. The secession now licensed preachers, and began to assume the attitude of a presbyterian kirk. In 1739 the Assembly cited the seceders to appear at their bar. They appeared accordingly in their corporate capacity as a presbytery, headed by their moderator; but instead of answering to their indictment, their moderator read an act of their own court, by which they condemned the established courts as not being lawful courts of Christ. The seceding moderator then formally declined the authority and jurisdiction of the Assembly, withdrew from the court, and the breach became irreconcilable. The Assembly then enacted "that for their declinature, contempt, and schismatical courses, they deserve deposition." They cited the Associate Presbytery to the bar of the next Assembly, 1740; but the seceders held their citation in due contempt. The Assembly of 1740, therefore, deposed the whole of the seceding brethren "from the office of the holy ministry, and prohibited them from exercising the same within the established church." In the year 1745 they had formed so many congregations all over the kingdom, that they formed several presbyteries and constituted a synod, and took the denomination of THE ASSOCIATE SYNOD. They had no sooner, however, reached this height of prosperity than they found a cause of division in the following clause of the Burgess Oath—"Here I protest, before God and your lordships, that I profess and allow with my heart, *the true religion presently professed within this realm*, and authorized by the laws thereof; I shall abide thereat, and defend the same to my life's end; renouncing the Roman religion called papistry." A part of the synod argued, that it was to the religion itself, and not to its

administration that they were called on to swear. It was from the religion, but from the *corruptions* in its administration, that they had seceded; and therefore the synod did not, without the most glaring self-contradiction, proscribe the swearing of the above clause *as in itself* sinful for the seceder. Others, again, contended that this oath, being administered for the security of the establishment, was to be understood in the sense of the imposers; and the *true religion*, to which it referred, must include the corruptions in its administration, on account of which they had seceded; that, in taking this oath they stultified themselves, and gave up the whole ground of their secession. The synod was now divided into two separate and hostile bodies; each asserted their secessions to be considered the original Associate Synod, and each party excommunicated the other. Those who took the Association Oath were called BURGHERS, and those who renounced it were called ANTIBURGHERS¹.

THIS PERIOD the Assembly exercised their executive powers with intolerable energy, and caused more secessions. Ministers sent to parishes were usually denominated "intruders," and violent settlements by the hands of the military were very common. A Mr. Andrew Richardson was presented to the church of Inverkeithing; but the people objected to him, and appealed to the Assembly, which was then sitting. The Assembly sent a peremptory order to the presbytery of Dumfries to induct Richardson without loss of time; and they commanded every minister within the presbytery to be present to witness the execution of their sentence. Mr. Thomas Gillespie, and five other ministers, refused obedience to the Assembly's mandate; and they were immediately summoned to the bar of the Assembly. They acknowledged their disobedience; but reminded the Assembly of the act of that year of 1736—"That it is, and has ever been, *since* the Revolution, the principles of this church, that no minister shall be inducted into any parish contrary to the will of the congregation."

This appeal to their own act only inflamed the irritabilities of the Assembly; and they deposed Gillespie, and dissolved his connection with his parishioners, but they only censured the other five ministers. The whole of these executive measures occupied only the short space of one week; their indecent haste in so solemn an affair gave great offence to many. This severe and unjust judgment was never recalled, and it occasioned another schism under the denomination of

Antiburghers' Display.—Testimony of the Original Seceders.—Brown's *Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Secession*, &c.

tion of the "*Presbytery of Relief*," and when they found their number increased, they also formed a synod, and that body is now known by the title of "the RELIEF SYNOD¹."

THE FOLLOWING extract of a letter, which had been admitted into the Scots Magazine, from a clergyman, shews the state in which the church was placed by the penal statutes. The first part of it is a recapitulation of the history of the church, exactly corresponding to that which has been given in these volumes down to the Revolution, when it concludes—"Since that time [the Revolution], the episcopal clergy have lived peaceably, not meddling in state affairs, but discharging the several offices of their function to those few, who, from a principle of conscience, adhere to them. And to this day, notwithstanding the heavy pressure they groan under from several acts of parliament, they quietly behave themselves, worshipping God in private with a very few. They have it for a principle not to disturb the peace of the kingdom they belong to, but rather to suffer, patiently, the greatest hardships, than to involve their country in confusion, devastation, and bloodshed. And in conformity to these principles, they never excited or encouraged any commotion. Nothing that savours of sedition appears in their sermons or prayers; though they cannot comply with the tests required by government, for reasons best known to their own consciences. Their practice is as innocent, quiet, and peaceable, as that of any other of the subjects; only they desire their principles may be safe, which they contain within their own heart, without disturbing the neighbourhood with disputes. By their principles every government is safe; they patiently submit, when they cannot entirely comply. They cannot dissemble or contradict their known principles, as too many for interest do. They honour princes in all circumstances, pity their misfortunes, and respect their persons. Why, then, are any other terms demanded of them than of all the subjects, seeing they enjoy no special or different privilege beyond others? In the exercise of their ministry their small support is from the bounty of their hearers, which no charitable christian ought to grudge. So that they ought to be allowed the same liberty and freedom which every mechanic enjoys, without being clogged with any further qualifying than the doing the offices his employment oblige him to. Is it not a very hard matter that the ministry of the gospel, which is of all other employments the most necessary and useful, and of all others ought to be most free from human

¹ Condensed from the Author's Book of the Constitution, and the authorities there cited.

impositions, should yet be clogged with conditions and terms from which others are exempted? And as to all attempts against the peace and quiet of the world, it is the most effectual security when truly and sincerely performed; and if any shall violate his trust and abuse his commission, let him be convicted and punished.

“Now, SEEING their principles with relation to government are so moderate, and their deportment under it so quiet, that every government is safe with them, it cannot but appear very severe to disturb the repose of them who are not inclined to disturb others, and to afflict and molest them by obliging them to speak or swear for things for which they have no freedom or clearness. And it is very strange that a simple connivance is grudged to those who never disoblige the government by any positive deed. All that is pretended against them is only *negative*; that through tenderness of conscience they cannot come up to some terms that others go into; and which terms were only intended to be a security upon those who have any place of trust in the government, which is not the case with any of the episcopal clergy¹.”

A REPORT was circulated, grounded on a letter from Orleans the 20th of September, that prince Charles Edward had abjured popery at Berlin, but it was not generally credited. The letter stated that he had broken up his household at Vignon, and had disposed of all his equipages, plate and furniture, horses, &c., and that he immediately divided the money arising from the sale among his servants according to their rank. At his departure he said to two of the chief of his late household,—“Gentlemen, when I could command money you always shared it with me. But my little fund being quite exhausted, I find myself under the necessity of telling you that you must shift for yourselves as well as you can, as you see I myself am now constrained to do, which may perhaps be in the end to *carry a musket* where I am not known. For friends, I have any, they are afraid to own me. Enemies in appearance I have many, but those, alas! unoffended, unprovoked by any thing base or dishonourable on my part; but all their punishment be their own reflections!” His abjuration of popery is mentioned in another letter from Amsterdam, in which the writer says, “of which there is little probability, unless he has a *dispensation* for so doing, as it would show him to be as bad a politician as his father or grandfather, the brother of his grandfather; since he would very likely by

¹ Scots Magazine, August, 1752, vol. xiv. p. 389.

that means lose not only all the friends which his religion preserves to him in England, Scotland, and Ireland, but even the catholic powers, who at present or who hereafter may support him,—as France, Spain, the Pope, and Romish clergy, especially the formidable society of the jesuits¹.”

1753.—THE ACT of parliament of the year 1748 entirely prevented the clergy from reaping any benefit from the permission in the act of 1746 in the registration of their letters of orders; for their orders were now declared to be null and void! “Thus, in 1746 and 1748, two laws were enacted against the Scotch episcopalians, which, under the pretence of eradicating their attachment to the house of Stuart, were so contrived as to preclude such of their clergy as were willing to pay allegiance to the reigning sovereign, and to pray for the royal family by name, from reaping the smallest benefit from their loyalty. The experiment was tried by some of them, of whom one venerable person, who was never suspected of undue attachment to the house of Stuart, is still alive; but he and his complying brethren had their chapels burnt, and were themselves imprisoned, as if they had been the most incorrigible jacobites. . . . This was a kind of persecution which, since the Reformation, had no precedent in the annals of Britain; a priest of the church of Rome, by renouncing the errors of popery, has at all times been qualified to hold a living in England; a dissenting minister, of whatever denomination, might at any time be admitted into orders and rise to the highest dignities in the English church [archbishop Secker and bishop Butler are cases in point]; but while the laws of 1746 and 1748 remained in force, there was nothing in the power of a Scotch episcopal clergyman to do, from which he could reap the smallest benefit;—by taking the oaths to government, he was not qualified to hold a living in England, or even to enjoy a *toleration* in Scotland, and his clerical character being acknowledged by the English bishops, he could not by those prelates be canonically reordained².”

THE “VENERABLE PERSON” to whom allusion is made above, was the rev. John Skinner, of Longside, whose chapel had been destroyed, and his house pillaged, although he had qualified himself according to the act of 1746. The qualifications, however, of that act were no protection against the exterminating decree of 1748. In the month of May he was

¹ Scots Magazine, vol. xiv. 505 and 549.

² Encyclopædia Britannica, Supplement, vol. i. p. 632; cited in Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Skinner, of Longside, vol. i. pp. x. xi.

rested, and taken before the sheriff in Aberdeen, for having transgressed the late act of parliament in officiating to more than four persons¹, probably in the same manner as Mr. Greig, of Stonehaven, is described to have done. Thinking it unnecessary to plead Not Guilty to a charge that could have been easily proved, Mr. Skinner made a voluntary confession, and acknowledged that in the discharge of his professional duties he had frequently officiated to more than the statutory number of persons. This was enough. He was committed to gaol in Aberdeen, on the 26th of May, for the period of six months, where he lay till the 26th of November. In the course of God's providence the most afflicting dispensations sometimes turn out to be the greatest blessings; and in this case the church has since derived much benefit from his learning and piety, in the composition and preparation for the theological works which he has left behind him. "When liberated," says his son and biographer, the late bishop of Aberdeen, in course of law, he felt the ties of duty, as their faithful pastor, greatly strengthened by gratitude for their attention during his absence to his wife and helpless family, which then consisted of six young children, all, under God, depending on him for their support. During his residence in a common prison, and suffering all the hardships of close confinement, next to a humble trust in the divine goodness, his chief resource lay in the conversation of a few worthy friends, at the hours when they were allowed to visit him, and in the liberal supply of books which they had the means of procuring for him. The activity of his mind seemed to increase in proportion to his want of bodily exercise; and though he amused himself now and then with some lighter productions of a poetical nature, yet the general bent of his thoughts lay towards more grave and serious subjects. As an instance of this, it need only be mentioned, that it was in prison he first conceived the idea of committing to writing his thoughts on the nature of that peculiar symbol of the divine presence, which is known to the biblical scholar under the Hebrew title of the Shekinah²."

1554.—MR. SKINNER'S case was not the only instance of oppression and persecution that occurred at that distressing period of the church's history. But the history of that time is so excessively meagre, that few individual instances can be traced; not that they did not exist, but that they were not

¹ *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Supplement, Vol. i. p. 632; cited in *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Skinner*, prefixed to his *Theological Works*, vol. i. pp. x. xi.
² *Biography* prefixed to *Theological Works*, vol. i. pp. xi. xii.

handed down by any friendly pen. Their enemies had neither compassion nor consideration for men who, like their divine Master, "bore their faculties so meekly," that they neither strove nor cried, nor was their voice heard in the streets. The two acts of parliament of 1746 and 48 did more for the effectual *extirpation* of the church of God, than all the violent and blood-thirsty efforts of the Solemn League and Covenant had been able to effect. The latter was the senseless ravings and assassinating propensities of a crafty jesuitical party, acting not only without, but against authority; but the former was the cool, calculating, deliberate act of an irresistible power. It deprived the clergy of liberty, of country, and even of life; and it stripped the laity, from the peer to the peasant, of his birthright, and of all his political privileges. No member of the church could sit in, or elect a member for either house of parliament; he could not hold any office under government; he could not hold a commission in the militia, or in the army or navy; he could neither elect, nor be elected, to any office, however mean, in the burgh magistracy; nay, he could not have been appointed to the humble situation of the town-crier in any burgh. In short, the christian creed of the clergy and laity of the church was more ruthlessly proscribed in Scotland, where christianity is *professed*, than the Greek portion of the Catholic church ever has been in Turkey, during the whole desolating revolt of Mohammedism. No doubt many in this time of trial fell away; but many more, especially in the higher ranks of society, fell into *infidelity*, and thus paved the way for that blasphemous and republican spirit which overspread the kingdom on the first outburst of the French revolution. The prohibition of the celebration of marriage by the episcopal clergy was now felt as a great grievance by the laity, and many marriages took place previous to the act coming into full operation. It is related, in a contemporary periodical, that on "Sunday, March 24, being the last day before the commencement of the Marriage Act, before eleven o'clock, forty-five couple were married at Mr. Keith's chapel; and when they closed, nearly a hundred [couple] had been joined together. Two men were constantly and closely employed in filling up licenses¹."

THESE ACTS produced another calamity, but of a more mixed nature, containing both good and evil: I mean the formation of a sect of INDEPENDENTS, under "the shadow of a foreign episcopacy." Those episcopalians who retained

¹ Scots Magazine, xvi. p.199. Anno, 1754.

some sense of religion, and who would neither turn infidel nor presbyterian, resorted to an intermediate plan, to evade the political penalties of the acts of parliament on the one hand, and to eschew the disgusting anti-churchism of presbytery on the other. It must be borne in mind, that the clergy were entirely prohibited from officiating to their congregations; and of course their people, who were both numerous and influential, were left like sheep in the wilderness without shepherds. In this state of bereavement and orphanacy, some of them took advantage of the words of the thirteenth section of the act of 1748, that no letters of orders could be valid or *legal* but those granted by an *English* or an *Irish* protestant bishop; and therefore many congregations in the large towns sent young theological students to England for ordination. These acted altogether independently of the catholic bishops of the church of Scotland, and pretended to yield canonical obedience either to the bishops of England collectively, or else to the particular bishop by whom they had been ordained. The English bishops, however, gave themselves no trouble about them, and never either publicly exercised any jurisdiction over them, or performed any episcopal offices among them. These independent meetings were chiefly in the capital and along the seaport towns on the eastern coast. And some of the nobility and gentry following their example, procured English ordained clergymen to settle on their estates, for their own and their tenants' convenience. In these congregations the English liturgy was used; and, as if unconscious of their state of schism and independence, they prayed to be delivered from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism—for the illumination of all bishops, priests, and deacons—for unity, peace, and concord—and to bring all that have erred and deceived into the way of truth. This had some resemblance to the Pharisee in the temple, while the catholic bishops and clergy were proscribed, and driven into the wilderness to perish. Yet, even at this their lowest point of depression, the faithful promise of God was fulfilled—that He would not suffer the gates of hell to prevail. Certainly nothing short of the arm of God could at this time have preserved the very being of a church and an apostolical succession; for, in the words of the judicious Hooker, “it was the general received persuasion of the ancient christian world, that ‘*ecclesia est in episcopo*,’ the outward being of a church consisted in the having of a bishop; insomuch that they did not account that to be a church which was not subject unto a bishop.”

SCHISM, THEREFORE, and political alienation, were the fruits of these antichristian acts of the British legislature ; but out of this grievous sin of schism there arose one good thing, which was the preservation of the laity in their attachment to the worship and discipline of the church. There were no obstacles to the opening of chapels by English ordained clergymen, and their gathering congregations in any place ; they were protected by law, and their congregations enjoyed all their political privileges. To these resorted all the *men* and the young people of both sexes ; and scarce any adhered to the catholic clergy, save the aged men and women, who either were indifferent to political privileges or who had none to lose. Thus, says Mr. Skinner, “as no vice is more dangerous than that which deceitfully puts on the mask of virtue, so these strange intrusions [of English ordained clergymen], under the fair and friendly shew, at first, of brotherly assistance, have in the end conduced, more than any avowed enmity would have done, to depress that episcopal succession in Scotland, which, bating the mistaken article of political scruple, the English bishops do acknowledge to be otherwise orthodox and valid¹.”

1755.—BUT THE AGE of persecution had not yet passed away. Mr. Arnott records the trial and conviction, this year, of the rev. James Connachar, who, “far in a wild, remote from human view,” at his own residence at a place called Gartlack, in the county and about twelve miles north-west of the town of Stirling, officiated numberless times on the same day, to the statutory number of *four persons*. Mr. Arnott introduces his account of the trial with the following remarks:—“John Connachar was a non-juring clergyman of the episcopal church of Scotland. His residence in a wild district of the highlands, where there was not within many miles a man of his knowledge and learning, gave him a degree of consequence, to which his irreproachable morals and unaffected piety added singular importance ; but his virtues were poisoned by his attachment to an unfortunate family, and the eminence of his situation and character, which, *in better times*, would have commanded felicity, served only *to attract the fire of political vengeance*. He was marked out as *a victim* whose ruin was to confound the remains of a vanquished party. The gentry in the north of Scotland professed almost universally either the episcopal or the popish religion, and meeting-houses were tolerated, where public worship was performed according to the

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 673-679.

liturgy of the church of England. But on the extinction of the rebellion, 1745, government thought proper to make an *indirect acknowledgment* of the king's title to the throne, in the most solemn addresses to God, an indispensable part of the formula. It commanded all episcopal clergymen, at every time they celebrated public worship before more than five persons, to pray for the king and royal family by name. As the gentlemen in that part of Scotland, for the most part, were attached to the house of Stuart, the act met with no other obedience than by many people absenting themselves entirely from church. Still, however, many devout people performed a duty which they thought acceptable to God, at the risk of incurring the *vengeance* of their temporal sovereign. *Various prosecutions* were accordingly instituted for this offence, and of these the most remarkable was that of the prisoner.

“AT THE DISTANCE of nine years after the extinction of the rebellion, he was apprehended in his own house by a party of soldiers, on a day (the 30th of January) upon which it was to be expected that he and his hearers would be engaged in their forbidden worship. The warrant for his commitment proceeded upon a petition from his majesty's advocate to the lords of justiciary, setting forth that Connachar, without having letters of orders in terms of law, and without having taken the oaths to government, had presumed to officiate as a minister by praying and preaching and administering the sacraments; also that his sermons were calculated to sow sedition and to excite disaffection. The prisoner having applied to the lord justice Clerk to be admitted to bail, his request was granted. But in the meantime he was detained in virtue of a new warrant of the court of justiciary, proceeding upon a new petition from the lord advocate, setting forth, that besides the offences for which the prisoner was at first incarcerated, he was so to be tried on the statute of Charles II. against celebrating clandestine or irregular marriages. [This statute was *repealed* in 1690¹.] It must be observed, that by the former of these acts, the prisoner, for the first offence, could only be subjected to six months' imprisonment, but by the latter he might be condemned to *perpetual* banishment.

“A FRESH BAIL BOND being offered, the prisoner was released on the 27th of February; and on the 10th of April he was brought to trial, before the circuit court of justiciary at Ayr, a district where the attachments of the people, and the fate of Stuart of Aucharn, who was capitally convicted

¹ *Ante*, vol. iii. p. 492.

some time preceding, left no reason to dread that the jury would make any great stretch to acquit the prisoner. He was charged with two offences;—the celebrating of marriage without being lawfully authorised by the established church of Scotland, or by any other legal authority; and celebrating it in a clandestine and disorderly way, contrary to the act of Charles II., 1 parl. sess. 1. c. 34¹.” Mr. Connachar acknowledged the fact of having married several parties, and, among others, the grand daughter of the unfortunate chief of Glen-coe, who fell a sacrifice to the political principles of the Revolution².

THE WHOLE TRIAL is given in the Scots Magazine; but more briefly by Mr. Arnott:—“It was pleaded,” he says, “for the prisoner, that the statute libelled on had been established directly with a view to support episcopacy against sectaries; and therefore to turn it as an engine of *destruction* against that religion which it was meant to protect, was totally to invert its purposes; that all the acts in favour of episcopacy had been abolished by William and Mary; that it behoved episcopacy either to be the established religion or not. If it was the established religion, the priest could not be condemned as unqualified to celebrate marriage. If it was not the established religion, it must be ranked among the sects of non-conformity; and even in that case the clergyman was equally safe, for all the laws against non-conformists were repealed [acts 5 and 27] of 1690. This construction of the statutes was confirmed by the universal sense of the nation; for although thousands of marriages had been celebrated, not only by episcopal clergymen, but by dissenters of all sorts, no prosecution had ever been brought on this branch of the statute alone. Nay, so little was our law scrupulous as to a clergyman, the celebrator of a marriage, being ordained by the established church, that a *valid* marriage might be pronounced by any civil magistrate; indeed, that the ceremony of marriage is not necessary to its validity³.”

WITH REGARD to the other part of the clause respecting clandestine and disorderly marriages, it was pleaded, “that in all the marriages celebrated by the prisoner, the parties had the consent of friends, and were likewise regularly proclaimed. By the interlocutor and the relevancy, it was found that both alternatives of the clause of the act 1661, recited in the libel, were still in force, as well as that which prohibits the celebra-

¹ Arnott's Criminal Trials.

² Scots Magazine, vol. viii. anno 1755, p. 203.

³ Arnott's Criminal Trials, pp. 341, 342.

n of marriage by ministers not of the established church, well as that which prohibits the celebration of marriage undestinely. After passing this interlocutor, a doubt was moved whether, as the prisoner was confessedly within the at-mentioned alternative, any proof was necessary? It was served from the bench, that a proof of the prisoner's innocence as to the charge of celebrating marriages clandestinely, would be an alleviation, and thereupon a proof was taken. The depositions were not put in writing. By the proof it appeared that the prisoner had married several persons, but that of them had proclamation of banns and consent of friends; and he proved that he had refused to marry without a proclamation, though offered ten guineas to do it. The prisoner's counsel, in his speech to the jury, suggested, that the interlocutor notwithstanding, it was competent for them to find not guilty. But on the other hand—lest the fountain of justice should purify the stream of political vengeance—it was observed from the bench, that the jury had no room for doubt—the present case, and that non-jurant episcopal ministers the prisoner's activity and diligence were *dangerous to our happy establishment*. The jury found the prisoner guilty, recommended him to mercy; and the court pronounced sentence, banishing the prisoner out of Scotland from and after the first of September next, never to return, *on pain of DEATH*."

IN THE SCOTS MAGAZINE the sentence is given at length, in it all sheriffs and other officers of the law were warned to search diligently for Mr. Connachar, if he should return after his banishment, and to transmit him to Edinburgh, that sentence of *death should be executed upon him*; and to afford him time to prepare for leaving the kingdom, he was dismissed immediately from the bar. From the same periodical we learn, that this persecuted priest of God set out, in the month of August, for England, in obedience to his sentence:—According to a letter sent to us by one who was present at his departure, he told his friends, 'that amidst those pangs which naturally feels on being for ever expelled from his native country, it gave him great consolation that he was not conscious of having done any thing immoral in celebrating marriages which occasioned so severe a sentence; that the friends were satisfied, and consented to all of them, there was no private prosecutor; that he had always held

Scots Magazine, anno 1755, vol. xvii. p. 207-209. — Arnott's Criminal

the celebrating of a marriage clandestinely, or without the consent of the persons interested, as a crime of a very deep dye, which no bribe would induce him to commit; that he never imagined it was illegal for protestant ministers, even those not of the established church of Scotland, to celebrate marriages when the friends gave their consent and banns were regularly proclaimed, though it was found so in his case, upon a clause of an old act in 1661, which he either never heard of or did not suspect to be in force, as he knew that marriages were openly celebrated almost every day, by the ministers of all the different persuasions in this country, without challenge. He regretted most of all the destitute condition of those poor people to whom he had ministered, and for whom he had spared no labour or fatigue, who, he said, would now have *no pastor of their own communion*, and therefore would be in great hazard of being perverted to popery by the artifices of Romish missionaries¹."

THE FOLLOWING LETTER to the primus, by the author of the Memoirs, of which I have so often availed myself, shews the bad feeling that existed in the diocese of Edinburgh towards bishop Keith. The letter is dated August 29th, and is addressed—"To the Right Rev. Mr. Robert Keith:—

"RIGHT REV. SIR,—Having wrote Memoirs of the Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Revolution in 1688, upon the best information I could get; there are several things consisting with my own knowledge of your conduct since you became bishop, which, I must confess, are stumbling and hardly reconcileable to the character you bear; and, therefore, before I publish the said Memoirs, I wish to be satisfied in these.

"1. UPON the 23d day of June, 1727, you and I were in the bishop of Edinburgh's house in Leith, where were present the bishop of Edinburgh, bishops Gadderar, Rattray, and Dunbar, the four then local bishops of Edinburgh, who subscribed a paper, in your sight and mine, called 'Terms laid down, &c.' In which paper it is declared that no order or unity can be preserved in any national or provincial church without a metropolitan; and that all do own bishop Arthur Millar for bishop of Edinburgh; and that as vicar-general of the now vacant see of St. Andrews, the metropolitcal powers are lodged in him. Though you were then a bishop, yet you concealed your character, and was no local bishop, and there-

¹ Scots Magazine, xviii. 1755, p. 410, 411.

fore did not subscribe the above paper; but, sure I am, you were pleased with it and approved of it, and, to my certain knowledge, wrote in support of it. Now, sir, why did you destroy the essentiality of order and unity? Alas! we have, indeed, been in confusion ever since; for in the month of December, 1731, you (all the other bishops concerned are dead) did elect a primus, set aside the metropolitan, and set the superintendent in his room.

“ 2. WHEN this new primus, whom you invested with a power of convoking and presiding, had called you, with the other bishops then alive, to meet here in Edinburgh on the 3d of July, 1734, why did you give in a declinature, and refuse to meet his call?

“ 3. IN the beginning of the year 1735, you applied to the primus to call or convocate the bishops, which he did, to meet in Edinburgh on the 18th of June; which being notified to you, why did you leave Edinburgh and go to Angus, and there, on the 24th of the said month of June, consecrate Mr. Robert White, even after receiving a protestation from the primus against it?

“ 4. THE primus being again prevailed upon to convocate the bishops on the 11th day of July, 1738, why did you bring along with you Mr. Robert Lyon as proxy for bishop Dunbar, without previously acquainting the primus?—and on his refusing to constitute the meeting till the proxy was set aside, why did you, with bishop Rattray and the proxy, constitute yourselves into a synodical meeting, and act accordingly, unless some very momentous affair had called you so to do, which does not appear from the minutes of that meeting?

“ 5. WHY is the diocese of Edinburgh kept without a proper bishop, when the presbyters applied once and again for a mandate to elect, and no mandate was ever given them? When the dioceses of Moray, Brechin, Dunkeld, and Aberdeen, are all supplied since Edinburgh became vacant; yea, the presbyters of Dunblane got a mandate sent to them to elect a successor to bishop White, and when, in consequence of that mandate, they did elect, why was their elect not consecrated? It does not appear to me that the presbyters of Dunblane applied for a mandate. But why is a mandate enjoined to be applied for, since you laid it down as a privilege the presbyters have, to elect without any mandate?

“ THESE, sir, I own, have been stumbling to me for a tract of years, and possibly may be so to many others, on the publication of my Memoirs, in which they are fully and, I am sure, fairly set forth. It is in your power to make me, on bet-

ter information, alter or add, and I shal construct yo^r silence, with which you have treated papers of greater consequence, a consent to the publication of them.

“ I am, R. R. Sir, your most humble servant¹.”

To THIS very unbecoming letter “no answer was ever sent” by bishop Keith, and with this letter the Appendix to the Memoirs is concluded. The Memoirs throw considerable light on the history of the period, but they are written in a hostile spirit towards the diocesan bishops. They were never published; but they are entirely, without any omission, embodied in this work. The original manuscript, in the author’s handwriting, but without any name attached, is, I believe, in the possession of the present bishop of Edinburgh.

1756.—MR. CONNACHAR’S persecution was evidently from political motives, arising out of the malevolent informations of some private enemies. The judge’s charge to the jury betrays it; and the severity of his sentence marks the exterminating purpose of that and similar trials that were at that time of frequent occurrence. Among others, the rev. Walter Stewart, residing at Ochilbeg, in Athole, was arrested in October 1755, and brought down prisoner to Perth, by order of John Swinton, esq. the sheriff depute of the county, on *an information* that he had transgressed the act 19 Geo. II., but was set at liberty on bail. He was tried before the sheriff depute of the county, on the 28th of December, at the instance of Mr. Alexander Wood, procurator-fiscal, on a charge of officiating on Sundays, in his own house, to more than four persons besides his own family, since Christmas 1755 till last October. He was found guilty on his own confession, and sentenced to six months’ imprisonment in the gaol of Perth, and to have his meeting-house shut up. This poor old confessor was in his seventieth year when he was called upon by a vindictive government to suffer for his divine Master. He “was forthwith committed to prison; his friends dread the consequence, as he is about 70 years of age. He was not accused of having transgressed the law since he was admitted to bail.” — After *dismissing* the minister, four of the faithful laity of his flock were also tried, at the instance of the procurator-fiscal, and fined five pounds sterling each, for having been present at divine service in Mr. Stewart’s house. One of these sufferers was a notary public, and, in addition to his fine, he was vindictively declared to have forfeited his

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 70-72.

and to be for twelve months incapable of holding any, either civil or military¹.

57.—ABOUT THE YEAR 1752, bishop Keith moved from his usual residence, in the Canongate of Edinburgh, to a small house and property on the banks of the water of Leith, called Bonnyhaugh, which afterwards descended to his daughter and her daughter by inheritance. In this retired and pleasant situation he “enjoyed the society of his daughter’s family, which was settled in that neighbourhood; diverted the languor of old age by study and religious meditation, and prepared his mind for that important change for which it had been the business of his life to prepare others. He died at Bonnyhaugh, between seven and eight o’clock in the evening, on the 20th of January, in the 76th year of his age. He was confined to bed only one day before his death—the day that he had been so confined during sixty-four years, which he had, as long as he lived in Edinburgh, been constantly afflicted with a nervous head-ache. He was buried in the Canongate churchyard, a few feet from the wall on the north side²;” at the south-east angle of whose grave rest the mortal remains of the wife of the youth and of the best friend of the present writer, with three of his infant children by another wife. The spot where the primate’s remains were deposited has been distinguished by a plain, upright, white headstone, surmounted by an urn, without any other inscription than the words “BISHOP KEITH.” The bishop of Glasgow, in concluding his biographical sketch, expresses a wish, in which the writer most cordially joins:—“May his merits be long cherished, and his virtues imitated in this noble church; and may his reputation for learning and piety inquiry stimulate others to follow his footsteps in the path of truth, and in the cultivation of sound and liberal education!”

MAY NOW be said of the church, what the poet of the Sea-breeze said of Winter,—“Here winter holds his *unrejoicing* reign.” It was silent desolation over all the kingdom; her altars were demolished, and her priests were proscribed, imprisoned, and banished. The virulence of the prosecutions against both clergy and laity gradually extirpated the lingering remnants of the national catholic church. The few, out of many instances that have been given, shew unequivocally that the church was wasted, her hedge thrown down, and her

¹ Scots Magazine, p. 624.

² As prefixed to the Catalogue of Scotch Bishops, xliii.

beauty spoiled. By Mr. Connachar's banishment, and Mr. Stewart's imprisonment at the age of seventy, two congregations were entirely lost to the church. Deterred by their fate on the one hand, and the fear of actual starvation on the other, no other clergymen coveted their *livings*, and their congregations gradually melted into the surrounding heresy, simply because they had neither priest nor altar, nor any memorial left of God's holy church. Nevertheless, although the laity were scattered and the priests proscribed, yet His providence still preserved a remnant of faithful worshippers, that neither took refuge from the storm in the Independent chapels where episcopacy was professed and the liturgy used, nor sank into the gulf of established perdition. At the time when the persecuting acts of parliament which produced these unmitigated evils were made, there were upwards of three hundred chapels under the jurisdiction of the catholic bishops of Scotland. Many of these were shut up after the persecution commenced, and their congregations dispersed; while others joined the Independent schism, and nourished as great a political hatred against the house of God as their mutual enemies the presbyterians. In the account of Mr. Stewart's trial, his indictment stated that he had officiated in his *own house* to more than four persons; whereas the sentence ordered his *meeting-house to be shut up*. Here is an apparent contradiction; but the truth is, although he had a chapel in which he had officiated before the persecuting act passed, yet, subsequent to that calamitous event, he could only read prayers to four at a time privately in his own house. The shutting up of the chapels was merely a legal fiction, marking the exterminating *intentions* of the legislature, but which did not make their case any worse, for they had been morally shut up by the provisions of the Black Act. "From the state of depression," says Mr. Skinner, "into which this church sunk after the convulsions of 1746 down to the present time [1788], there occurs little material, either in her outward appearance or internal transactions, further than what is necessary to the very being of a church, and common in every description of one. The *discouragements* under which she laboured, by the great ones abandoning her communion, and the youth whom she had bred withdrawing their assistance, seemed to threaten her with *a total and speedy annihilation*. And though from that she was providentially *preserved*, yet the failure of these inward supports, making way for *extraneous encroachments*, did *actually throw her into a kind of gradual and wasting* CONSUMPTION. This malady was increased, for some years, by a repe-

ion now and then of some little stroke from the old hostile
arter, which, though not to be called persecution, served to
ep her down under the weight which the new laws had
d upon her. . . . These persecutions were not indeed
eral, and seemed to be rather the effects of private pique
particular views, than of any formed design among those
o were vested with public authority. But coming out
der the colour of law, and in such gloomy times, they had
intended effect of adding to the damp with which the face
our church had been already overspread, and distressed
clergy, as being all in the same predicament, *with a perpe-
l uncertainty whose turn it might be next*¹."

IN THIS HORRIBLE state into which the small remnant of the
y catholic church was plunged, the established dissenters
n it were afflicted with a Jeroboamite priesthood. Sin
ounded in a greater degree than formerly, and infanticide be-
e fearfully prevalent. "A more rigid decree," says Mr. Ar-
t, "than what now prevails, was established in the reign of
lliam. . . . The slightest informalities between the sexes ex-
ed jealous abhorrence. To avoid the disgrace of the *re-
ting stool*, many a miserable wretch dared a guilt which was
be expiated by the pain and ignominy of the *gallows*.
e presbyterian clergy, in matters of scandal and of witch-
ft, arrogated to themselves the office of public prosecutors,
nquisitors-general; and so late as the year 1720, the minis-
s, in behalf of themselves and their kirk sessions, publicly
rcised this office in our courts of justice! Their busy zeal
unting after young women whom they suspected of being
h child, and after old women that lay under the imputa-
n of witchcraft, was productive of *the most dismal conse-
nces*. In one case, their persecution was directed at un-
opy women who had obeyed the impulse of nature; in the
er, at those who incurred the imputation of doing what
ure rendered it impossible to do. In both, the pains and the
ty of the clergy were productive of the same issue — the
ving miserable creatures to the gallows. And the recorded
ivictions before the court of justiciary at Edinburgh, of
enty-one women for child-murder, and three men for beasti-
y, in the space of seven years, afford a melancholy proof
the evils attending the cutty-stool and the presbyterian dis-
line².

¹ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 679, 680.

² Criminal Trials, 310, 311.

CHAPTER LXXII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND ROBERT WHITE,
BISHOP OF DUNBLANE,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1757.—Bishop White elected Primus.—Application from the Edinburgh clergy to the bishops.—Elect a bishop—is rejected.—1758.—Several minor transactions.—1759.—Consecration of Mr. Edgar.—1760.—The bishop of Ossory.—Death of George II.—Accession of George III.—Better prospects.—No address sent to Court.—1761.—Chapels begun to be erected.—Death of the Primus—his letter to a clergyman.

1757.—AT THE DEATH of bishop Keith, the Episcopal College consisted of bishops White, Falconar, Raitt, Alexander, and Gerard¹. It does not appear, from any authority that I have been able to consult, that there was any meeting of the Episcopal College; and therefore I conclude that the election of a new Primus had been accomplished by the written suffrage of the surviving bishops. It is somewhat doubtful whether they could have met and transacted such an affair without drawing down the vengeance of the law upon their heads: but in whatever way it was accomplished, the bishop of Dunblane was duly elected *Primus Scotiæ episcopus*.

THE AUTHOR of the Memoirs again supplies some interesting particulars of the history of this period. “Soon after bishop Keith’s death, proposals were made by the presbyters in Edinburgh to the bishops for accommodating matters, and removing the differences that had long subsisted between the bishops and them. Repeated applications were made to the bishops to know what they designed to exact of the presbyters in order to peace, which, though long delayed, at length they came; and though the terms were humbling, yet the presbyters agreed to them; and all they asked of the bishops

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 58.

was, to suspend the canons of 1743 to the diocese of Edinburgh, as having been no ways represented in that synod. This the bishops would not grant, so that all hopes of peace were gone; however, some of the laity resolved to try what they could do to remove the differences and preserve peace. Accordingly, a plan of pacification is by them drawn up, and sent to bishop Falconar and Mr. Robertson, who met and examined it, and agreed that the design of sending copies of the said plan to them, was, that they might communicate it to their brethren—bishop Falconar to the bishops, and Mr. Robertson to the presbyters. Mr. Robertson did impart it to all the presbyters, who all approved of it, and heartily wished it success. If bishop Falconar did impart it to his brethren, it would seem they did not approve of it, for it dropt¹. Not the least hint is given of this “plan” which had been proposed, so that no judgment can be formed of its merits, or fitness for the restoration of harmony between the clergy of Edinburgh and the governors of the church.

HE CONTINUES,—“The presbyters of Edinburgh, with some of the principal laity, finding all methods hitherto tried to accommodate matters with the bishops had taken no effect, thought the election of an *interim* bishop might not only cement the present divisions, but bring about a lasting peace, did therefore elect Mr. A. R. their bishop [probably the Mr. Robertson above mentioned], and sent the deed of election to bishop White, primus of the bishops, who, after four months’ silence, wrote an angry letter to Mr. A. R., objecting against the deed of election. To which the electors gave a full answer in very distinct terms; but no notice is taken of it².” Much of this bad feeling seems to have arisen from a misunderstanding betwixt the bishops and the Edinburgh clergy, respecting the office of primus. It appears to have been an understood arrangement among the prelates, that whomsoever they elected primus should *ex officio* become bishop of Edinburgh; and the obstinacy of the clergy of that diocese in not electing the primus to be their ordinary, or at least to recognise him as such, seems to have occasioned all the jarring betwixt them. This may be a wrong view of the case, but I can account in no other way for the line pursued by the bishops, in persisting in keeping that diocese without a bishop for so many years, or, as the clergy very appropriately called it, keeping them in a “state of orphancy.”

1758.—“Something uncommon,” he proceeds, “happened

¹ MS. Memoirs, pp. 58, 59.

² Ibid. 52.

during this interval. Bishop White, primus, after receiving the above deed of election, wrote to a clergyman living in Dumfries, soliciting his vote for MR. HARRY EDGAR to be consecrated bishop of Glasgow. The clergyman gave no answer¹. Mr. John Home, presbyterian minister of Athelstoneford, composed the chaste and simple tragedy of Douglas, and, along with several other ministers, witnessed its performance in the Theatre Royal. This gave mighty offence both to the ministers and to the people; and Mr. Home was in consequence compelled to resign his living, and console himself in a voluntary exile in England. Dr. Carlyle, one of the most eminent of his friends, was publicly rebuked and admonished by the General Assembly. Dr. Robertson, the historian of Charles V., was, by an act of "transportability," brought from the parish of Gladsmuir to Edinburgh, and installed principal of the university; and he justly acquired that ascendancy in the assemblies and commissions which was commensurate with his public life. He was the leader of what was called the moderate or rational party in the Assembly.

1759.—No NOTICE was taken of the application from the diocese of Edinburgh for the consecration of a bishop for that diocese; which gives reason to suppose that the primus considered himself their immediate ordinary. This view may be partly confirmed by the consecration of Mr. Henry Edgar, a priest in the town of Dundee, as *coadjutor* to the primus. All the printed accounts agree in naming All Saints' Day, or the first of November, as the day of his consecration; but the author of the Memoirs, who was a contemporary, and had a direct interest in watching the proceedings of the primus at this time, alleges that "bishop White, with *the other* bishops, did consecrate the said Mr. Edgar on St. Luke's day [18th of October, 1759] at Cupar, in Fife, although he was not elected by any presbyters²." The consecrator was bishop White, primus, assisted by bishops Falconar, Raitt, and Alexander.

1760.—It is MUCH to be regretted that Mr. Skinner's Ecclesiastical History is so brief at this its most interesting period, when he himself was a living actor in many of the events which he might have recorded. He informs us that Dr. Pocock, bishop of Ossory in Ireland, made a tour this year in Scotland in search of the picturesque, and, breaking through all canonical rules, he administered the rite of confirmation in some

¹ MS. Memoirs.

² Ibid. p. 60.—Skinner's List for Bishop Seabury.—Keith.—Perceval's Apology.—This consecration is omitted in App. to Primitive Truth and Order.

of the Independent meeting-houses in the northern dioceses, and thereby became guilty of the sin of schism. “As no vice,” says Mr. Skinner, “is more dangerous than that which deceitfully puts on the mask of virtue, so these *strange intrusions*, under the fair and friendly shew at first of brotherly assistance, have, indeed, conduced more than any avowed enmity could have done to depress that episcopal succession in Scotland, which, bating the mistaken article of *political scruple*, the English bishops do [1788] acknowledge to be otherwise orthodox and valid¹.”

GEORGE II. died at Westminster, on the 25th of October, in the seventy-seventh year of his age, and the thirty-third of his reign. He was a persecutor of the church, and had done more towards its effectual extirpation than either the solemn league and covenant, the rabbling, or all the vindictive spite of presbyteries or General Assemblies had effected. His son, Frederick, prince of Wales, died in the year 1751, and his grandson, George III., succeeded to the throne in the twenty-third year of his age. “By the clemency of his disposition, and the mildness of his government hitherto, he has shewn himself the true son of a father who, in domestic life, which was the only sphere he was allowed to shine in, was as humane and amiable a character as ever England had seen possessing that princely title. Soon after his accession, this young prince concluded a peace with his two brother kings of France and Spain, with whom his grandfather had left him at war; and shewed likewise, by the choice of his ministry and other arrangements in the state, how much he wished to banish all national prejudices, and to root out, by acts of generosity, that disaffection to his family which had been supposed peculiar to Scotland. Encouraged by these early symptoms of placability towards national enemies, and of an equal and impartial regard towards all his subjects, our church by degrees *revived a little* from her former depressed state, and our clergy thought they now saw the agreeable prospect of better times, under a government which has begun in so promising a way²”

ON THE ACCESSION of George III. there was an universal expectation of a more impartial reign than the nation had experience under the first princes of his house. They had been German in every thing, in tastes, manners, and predilections; but the new king was born in England, was never in all his life above an hundred miles from London, and shewed a strong

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 672, 673.

² Ibid. 680.

desire to remove the prejudices that existed in all the three kingdoms against his family. Every political and religious party, therefore, sent up congratulatory addresses to the throne, except the dispirited and persecuted catholic church of Scotland. But the ministers, who had set up Independent meetings all over the kingdom, sent up addresses, not as from one united corporation, which they never seem to have been; but those ministers who resided near each other united, and framed addresses, which they committed to the charge of some nobleman who lived in their neighbourhood to present at court. In the depressed and persecuted state of the church, the bishops offered no congratulation; it would, in their then circumstances, have been utter hypocrisy to have expressed their gratification at the accession of a prince who might, for any thing they as yet knew, be a greater persecutor than his grandfather had been. Besides, during the last two reigns, they had been in such bad odour at court, that they were extremely doubtful what sort of a reception their address might have experienced;—who was to present it? It was the loss of all civil and political privileges to hold any intercourse with the national heritage of God. Not one nobleman or gentleman would have ventured to have intimated the existence of such an address; there was contamination in its very touch; the very suspicion of being suspected of contending it would have crushed all the political hopes and aspirations of any courtier who would have been so fool-hardy as to have undertaken the charge of it. Under all these circumstances, therefore, it is by no means wonderful that the bishops and the few remaining clergy sat still, and patiently awaited the interference of their Lord and Saviour in their behalf; whilst, on the other hand, it was the interest and the policy of all the different sects and parties to outbid each other for the royal favour, and to magnify their own political importance.

1761.—A VERY SHORT TIME, however, served to shew the fathers of the church that the new king had no desire to continue the persecution of the Scottish church; and in consequence more than the formidable number, *four*, ventured to meet in their own private dwellings. This being overlooked or conuived at, they began to think of re-erecting the churches that had been ruthlessly burnt down by the duke of Cumberland, and to re-open those that had been shut up by the legal authorities, since the enactment of the Black Act of 1748. And now, says Mr. Skinner, “under all the difficulties that such confined meetings were daily exposed to, both from within and from without, they had the satisfaction, in allevia-

on of their many other anxieties, to find their people's patience and steadfastness, in the trying course of sixteen or eighteen years, such as would have been no disparagement to the character of primitive times; and such, too, as their very enemies admired, and even praised them for. But many of the old were going off the stage, and a new generation gradually rising up, who had felt little of the past shock, it was hoped there would be no danger now to make a calm attempt, where it could be done, for further accommodation in their attendance upon religious duties, and, under the protection of heaven, to trust to the lenity of an administration, which seemed to see no necessity for the continuance of former severities. There were some young men, too, beginning to appear now for the ministerial office, where their labours might be called for, which was another incitement to the proposed erection, and was likewise a lucky circumstance for reversing the church out of that fatal decay under which she had so long been languishing¹."

SOME OF THE BISHOPS being desirous at this time of having Mr. Forbes, the episcopal incumbent at Leith, consecrated, perhaps with the view of having a bishop resident at least in the metropolis, "wrote to one of the presbyters in the diocese of Ross to apply to their primus (bishop White) to grant a mandate to them to elect a bishop for themselves. Bishop White wrote them that if they would elect one of themselves they should receive a mandate, but if they were to elect a presbyter who resided at a distance from them, and who could be of little or no use to them, he would grant no mandate." Declining, therefore, to elect one of their own number in the diocese of Ross, there was no mandate sent to them at that time. It appears there were only three priests in the diocese of Ross at the time they petitioned for leave to elect a bishop².

IN THE MONTH of August this year, the venerable primus was gathered to his fathers, after having guided the church through the terrible conflict into which it had been thrown by the consequences of the invasion of prince Charles Edward. In writing to one of his clergy, who had asked his advice respecting a member of his congregation, who, to advance his worldly prospects, was desirous of using a species of occasional conformity with the kirk, and yet to continue in the church, bishop White wrote to his correspondent, the Rev. David Ramsay, at Dunning, strongly deprecating any such sinfulitudinarianism, saying—"Even the forsaking to assemble

¹ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 681.

² MS. Memoirs, 60.

ourselves together for uniting in the public worship of the church, is a breach of this 'steadfastness' [Acts ii. 42]; much more is the forsaking the church assemblies, and joining those set up in opposition to them. This is the *touching the unclean thing* [2 Cor. vi. 17]; the involving ourselves in the peculiar guilt, though not of an idolatrous separation, yet one of a deep die, a schismatical one; it is the 'going out from us,' *i. e.* from the forementioned fellowship, and the 'not continuing in it.' If one goes to religious assemblies, it must be to join in the worship, the chief design of them, otherwise he had as well stay at home. If this joining separatists is called occasional communion only, (which perhaps that gentleman thinks consistent with communicating with the church), there is no place for such a distinction, there can be no such thing as occasional communion with the catholic church and those not of her; the notion is absurd with regard to this [church], and is only applicable to christians, as their occasions lead them, communicating with other sound parts of the church than that where they reside. The church is but one body, and catholic communion is only in unity with this one body, and joining in worship is an act of communion. Perhaps that gentleman satisfies himself with this, that he can join schismatical assemblies without owning a relation to them as a member, and so thinks himself in communion with the church, notwithstanding these occasional acts of communion with those divided off from the church; but this is not only inconsistent with keeping her unity, but it is the being of no church at all. He casts himself *out of* the catholic church, in as far as he communicates with a schismatical body; and by the principle he is supposed to go upon, he is not of the dissenting church, and so is of none. Add to this, that the episcopal and presbyterian churches being *separate and opposite bodies*, sure there must be a schism, and wherever it lies, by joining both, he makes sure work of being a schismatic himself. But as you are persuaded that the schism lies on the presbyterian side, he ought to excuse you for not complying with his desire, until you come to think as he does, unless he will condemn you, as stiff and bigotted, for not dropping principles in his favour, before you see reason for so doing. He must be a very singular man that won't take up the notion of schism and the danger of it, and yet more singular, who believes such a thing and *does not see it in Scotland*; and he must be a singular sort of christian who sees a schism and does not think himself concerned to know on which side it lies, that convinced of its being a crime, he may stand clear of it. . . . It is plain the less reason there

for a schism the greater is the guilt of making it; as the weight taken from one scale to the other makes it more preponderate, so the extenuating of the cause aggravates the schism. But there is one thing said and another seen. They [the presbyterians] persist still in the schism on the same grounds on which it was commenced; and these are not *mere ceremonies*; unless we come to think the instituted government of the church—the suppressing it—declaring against—setting up a new coined one in opposition to it—the not keeping her unity where there are no sinful terms of communion required—the difference between valid and invalid orders—the usurping the powers of the priesthood—and setting up a new altar, matters of no moment. He who thinks these nothing *but ceremonies*, may think so of the whole of the instituted religion, and particularly of the holy sacrament of the Eucharist. And sure any who entertain such a thought of it, had need of a better conception of the nature of it, before he ventures partaking in it. If *the cause* of the schism *is at the presbyterian's door*, why should he not let it lie there without partaking in it? Is the going to public worship an inducement? and must he seek for that *without* the church schismatical assemblies? Sure, better labour under the persecution, and make it up in his closet or family, rather than risk the being involved in the guilt of schism. It is not enough to acquit him of this, that his conscience does not condemn him. We see too much of this, that men can do bad things, and vindicate their doing so; by this, if a man sins against his conscience, he is no doubt self-condemned; *and if our hearts condemn us not* of wilful sin, but we are conscious of having done our duty with a sincere and upright heart, *we have we confidence towards God*. This obliges us to stand off from what we know to be sin, and to make inquiry for informing our consciences of the lawfulness of what we do. But the conscience does not alter the nature of good and evil, and may be abused in judging of it. If one ventures on doing anything of moment, against which there lies a presumption of unlawfulness, without first being satisfied of its being lawful, he is no doubt guilty, *for whatsoever is not of faith is sin*; in that one does without due conviction of its lawfulness, he is guilty; which is the true portrait of that often misapplied text, *we have we confidence towards God*. To have no scruple of doing anything, nay, even approbation of conscience, will not justify if it is not agreeable to the laws of God, and approved of him. These are the rules of conscience, by which the lawfulness of our actions are to be tried; were it not so, man

would be law unto himself independent of God the supreme; which is what our infidel schemes, in favour of *reason*, for avoiding the necessity of *revelation*, land in. No doubt heretics and schismatics may be free of scruple, so may idolaters, but this does not alter the nature of idolatry, heresy, or schism, nor will it justify such before God. If want of scruple did, then the Jews and first persecutors, *who thought they did God good service*, had claims to it; as had Raviellac and Catesby, who had no scruple for what they did. However this may be thought harsh and disobliging, it is charitably designed for correcting a too common and yet dangerous mistake. I trust this gentleman is sincere, and will lay himself open for having his conscience rightly informed; and if, after his own impartial inquiry, and your laying before him the unlawfulness and danger of the condition he makes, he cannot be persuaded out of it, I hope he will not think his conscience a rule to others, nor the worse of them that they do not sooth him in what they judge to be an error, and countenance his continuing in it¹."

THIS LETTER, dated March 22d, 1740, was written before the last severe persecution began, and is aimed at apostatising to the established kirk; but the arguments apply fully as potentially to the independent chapels, which began to multiply after the Black Act commenced to operate. Bishop White puts the schism upon its right footing, and so that no man can either mistake or plead ignorance. The same state of schism remains at the present day; for it has not been altered in its nature, either by length of time, or by the greater respectability which the establishment has since attained. The present race have grown up in the full persuasion that the Scottish branch of the catholic church *dissents* from that which they have been taught to think the true church, and "out of which, they say, there is *no ordinary possibility of salvation*²." But their firm persuasion of this opinion does not alter the fact, that the Scottish establishment is not only not a church, but that it is itself a dissenter from the whole catholic church throughout the world; and therefore it is in deadly schism. May what the bishop has here written, however, redound to his Master's glory, and to the benefit of those who are unhappily enmeshed in heresy and schism!

¹ Episcopal Magazine, December, 1835, vol. iii. 358-361. The original MS. is in the possession of the Right Rev. Dr. Low, bishop of Ross and Argyle.

² Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. xxv. sect. 2.

CHAPTER LXXIII.

**PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND WILLIAM FALCONAR,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,**

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1762.—Bishop of Moray elected primus.—Mr. Robert Forbes elect of Ross—his consecration.—**1763.**—Mode of worship.—Anecdote of Mr. Skinner.—**MR. JOHN SKINNER** ordained.—The communion office.—**1764.**—State of the kirk—revisal of the communion office—particulars—its consistency.—**1765-6.**—Communion office.—**1767-8.**—Death of bishop Gerard—consecration of bishop Kilgour.—**1769-1773.**—State of the church.—Bishop of Down and Connor ordains.—Council of Antioch cited.—Patronage.—Case of St. Ninians.—Mr. Thomson's induction—address to him.—Heresy not stationary.—**1776.**—State of the church.—Bishop Rose of Dunblane consecrated.—**1774.**—Consecration of bishop Petrie.—Death of bishop Alexander.—Catechising recommended.—Death of the Royal Exile.—**1777.**—Death of bishop Forbes—and bishop Raitt.—Mr. Skinner removed to Aberdeen.—**1778.**—Bishop Innes consecrated.—State of the kirk.—**1779-1781.**—Tumults.—Popery.—Socinianism.—Meeting of heritors.—Resignation of bishop Falconar, and election of bishop Kilgour.—Leaders in the General Assembly.

1762.—ON THE DEATH of bishop White, Mr. William Falconar, then bishop of Moray, was elected primus of the church of Scotland. We are informed that the clergy of the diocese of Ross received no answer from the late primus respecting the election of a bishop, but after his death "bishop Falconar became primus, and then the presbyters got a mandate, and soon elected Mr. Robert Forbes. There were but three presbyters in that diocese [of Ross], and when the deed of election was sent to the primus, and the 24th of June was appointed for the day of consecration, in the town of Forfar, the primus, with bishops Alexander and Gerard, consecrated the elect.¹"

¹ MS. Memoirs, p. 60.

Under the head of Caithness and Orkney, in the Appendix to Keith's Catalogue, bishop Russell says—"This district having been long vacant, the presbyters of the two northern dioceses at length made choice of Mr. Forbes, minister in Leith, as a fit person to be their bishop. He was accordingly consecrated at Cupar in Fife on the 24th of June, 1762, by bishop Falconar, bishop Alexander, and bishop Gerard. The distance of his charge seems not to have prevented him from fulfilling the duties which attached to it; for upon consulting his register, which is now in my hands, I find long lists of the young people, whom he had from time to time confirmed, in different parts of his diocese¹." This seeming contradiction, however, is cleared up by Mr. Skinner, who says that bishop Forbes was consecrated at Forfar by the before-mentioned bishop, and "appointed bishop of Ross and Caithness²." The three dioceses of Ross, Caithness, and Orkney, contained so few clergymen that they were all united together under bishop Forbes.

1763.—SINCE THE ACCESSION of the third George the penal laws began to be less rigorously enforced; and, instead of *four* persons, according to law, as many as the clergyman's house could contain were admitted. Many had to remain on the outside, either standing or seated on benches, whether in rain or snow. The door or windows were left open, and the priest being placed near to the open door or window, was heard and responded to by those without, as well as by those within the house. In this way the REV. ARTHUR PETRIE served the cure at Micklefolla, after the death of the worthy Mr. Lunan, who was ejected from the parish church. This was also the usual manner of all the faithful few that still adhered to the church; and a humorous anecdote is related by the late bishop Skinner, in his Life of his Father:—"After the destruction of his chapel," he says, "the people assembled for worship in his dwelling-house, where no more than four persons, besides the family, could be legally present. His temporary desk being placed in an open passage, and immediately in front of the entry (that more might hear than met the preacher's eye), a *hen* had one day unfortunately found her way into one of the apartments, and *cackled* 'as she went, for want of thought.' The people taking measures to rid themselves of the noisy intruder, the persecuted fowl took

¹ Keith's Appen. 550.—MS. Memoirs, p. 60.

² Ecclesias. Hist. ii. 683.—List for Bishop Seabury, 39.—Prim. Truth and Order, Appen. 523.—Perceval's Apology, 255.

ight, and darting through the passage, just as the parson had given out his text, dissipated in her flight the unstitched pages which were carefully recorded 'each thought that breathed, and word that burned,' and gave them to the merciless winds. At once high 'poised in air,' all attempts to restore to the bewildered preacher the well-penned effusions of his theological skill were vain. 'Their place could no where be found'! His rash without maturest thought to vow, and yet the vow which, in a luckless hour, a calamity so dire impelled Mr. Skinner rashly to make, he, to his dying hour, deferred not to pay; by which means, to the unavailing regret of all his friends '*tot congestos, noctesque, diesque labores, hauserit una es!*'"

AT THIS TIME the scarcity of labourers in the Lord's vineyard was very great. Poverty and persecution deterred many even of those who had been previously preparing for holy orders; yet there were not wanting young men of great zeal and moral courage, who ventured to serve the Lord in this time of rebuke and blasphemy. Amongst these was MR. JOHN SKINNER, the son of the worthy minister of Longside. Such, says his biographer, "was the want of labourers in the humble graveyard of the Scotch episcopal church, that although but recently entered into his twentieth year, Mr. John Skinner was, by his over zealous father, urgently required to quit his comfortable situation in the family of Sir Hugh Sturgeson, of Bannockburn, near Stirling, and repair to Aberdeen, for admission into holy orders." Mr. Skinner was ordained at Aberdeen, by bishop Gerard, some time in July, and was settled in the village of Ellon, with the charge of another congregation, about eight miles distant, at Ludquharn. "In this extended charge young Mr. Skinner laboured most assiduously and usefully for the space of eleven years, having, for the first two or three years of his incumbency, to officiate during the summer season twice every Sunday, and to travel less a distance than fifteen or sixteen miles to and from the different chapels where his people assembled; the emoluments of the charge, from written documents under his own hand, varying from £25 to £30 per annum²."

ABOUT THIS TIME the bishops had begun to consider of the propriety of deliberately reviewing the communion office, and some allusion is made to this determination in a private

Life, prefixed to Theological Works, i. ccvi.

Memoirs of Bishop Skinner; prefixed to Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, from the year 1788 to the year 1816 inclusive By the Rev. John Skinner, A.M. 8vo. 1818.

letter from the REV. GEORGE INNES to bishop Alexander, dated the 23d of February this year, in which he says,—“Bishop Gerard bids me tell you, that with regard to what bishop Falconar proposes about altering or amending the communion office, he is not fond of any further alterations, as we have every thing essential, and our enemies are so apt to make a bad use of any thing of this kind¹.

1764.—AFTER THE violent excitement had subsided under which the kirk had accomplished the Revolution, she fell, as she has always done under similar circumstances, from her glory into the opposite extreme of lukewarmness, and what they call moderatism. Her latest historian says—“Several very glaring cases of intrusion occurred; such as that of Kilmarnock, in 1764, and that of Shotts, in 1765, where the presbytery had rejected Mr. Wells, on his trials, as being, if not *wholly deficient*, yet *so low* and *mean* in the knowledge of divinity, that he did not come up to the character of a minister of the gospel. Yet the Assembly reversed this judgment, and ordered him to be ordained; and when the opposition of the people was so great that it could not be accomplished in the parish, he was ordained in the sessions-house [vestry-room] at Hamilton. Many cases occurred, also, of such atrocious immorality, that it is not fitting to stain these pages with their recital; and yet all these cases were defended, and the delinquents screened by the moderates, till, in some of them, the strong indignation of insulted public decency compelled the sentence of deposition to be passed. . . . It may seem a very pertinent question to ask, how such criminal conduct could be permitted to pass unpunished, much more how it could be sheltered by church courts under the management of Principal Robertson, a high-minded honourable man, whose own moral character was altogether unimpeachable. Simply because his views of church government was directly anti-scriptural, founded upon a worldly principle, and pervaded throughout by worldly principles. In his mind the idea of an established church was exceedingly simple, and exceedingly false. He regarded it as merely a subordinate court, created by the state, and possessed of no authority but what was derived from human laws².” Although this account is strongly tinged with the political venom of free-kirkism, yet there is no doubt that much that he says is but too true.

“IN THIS FAVOURABLE appearance of returning serenity, it was thought proper to *revise* our communion office, and bring

¹ Cheyne's Vindication.

² Hetherington's History, p. 220.

, now that there was *no contention or difference about it*, to exact a conformity with the ancient standards of eucharistic service as it could bear. This revisal was undertaken in 1765 [1764] by two of our bishops who were well versed in these matters; and, by some few alterations of expression, and a judicious arrangement of the several parts, especially by restoring the Invocation to its original position after the Oblation, instead of standing as it had done before the words of institution, have put the whole of that solemn office into such form as will be acknowledged by every one who is in the least conversant in antiquity to be the most agreeable to the nature and design of that divine institution itself, and at the same time best adapted both to *fence against the novel doctrine* of transubstantiation, and to silence any idle clamours which ignorance or prejudice had raised, or might raise, about : inclining to popery¹." It was not a new communion service that was now compiled for the first time, but *a revision of the old office*, that had been in use in the church almost from the time that the Liturgy came into general use, immediately after the Revolution. The office thus subjected to revision was neither the English one nor that compiled for the church of Scotland in 1637; but "another office still nearer in form to the present, which seems to have been its immediate basis. In 1755 there appeared 'the communion service for the use of the church of Scotland, as far as concerneth the ministration of that holy sacrament. Authorised by King Charles I. Anno 1636.' In arrangement this office corresponds precisely with the present, except that the offertory precedes the exhortation—"Dearly beloved in the Lord, &c." And in practice it was intended that even that variation should be rectified, for on the reverse of the title page is the 'Direction'—"Begin the office with the exhortation; then read the sentences, which ought not to have been printed before, but after the exhortation. . . . The words therein enclosed in crotchets, thus [*]², are to be read by the presbyter presenting the elements and offertory on the altar.' The different parts follow each other in precisely the same order as in the revised office of 1764. The prayer of consecration

Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 682.

These are the words which the Rubric of the present Office directs the presbyter to say, when he presents the alms upon the holy table—"Blessed be thou, O Lord God, for ever and ever: Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the glory, the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in heaven and in the earth is Thine: Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all; riches and honour come of Thee, and of thine own do we give unto Thee. AMEN.

its very uniformity and universality, bears upon it the impress of apostolic tradition, it is this order of the ministration of the holy communion which the church in Scotland, by the faith and patience of her bishops, happily attained¹."

1765-6.—THE COMMUNION OFFICE, published under the inspection of bishop Falconar, passed into general use, and a new edition of it was published in the year 1765, brought out under the care of bishop Forbes. "The publication of two editions in such rapid succession shews that the revised office must have passed into immediate and general use, implying a simultaneous act of authority on the part of the bishops, at least individually, which implies again that the review had been a deliberately concerted act²."

1767-8.—BISHOP GERARD, of Aberdeen, died in October. He is characterised by Mr. Cheyne as having been a prelate of "deep piety and manly sense;" and one of those noble confessors for the truth who, at this time, "amid obloquy and persecution, were struggling with apostolic poverty, but with apostolic faithfulness to 'keep that good thing committed to them;' their worldly circumstances *not* placing them above the pressure of *absolute want*, while a prison opened for them if they ventured to pray *with more than five* [*four*] *individuals* at once³." In the following year the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen met in that city, and elected Mr. ROBERT KILGOUR, presbyter at Peterhead, to be their ordinary. He was consecrated bishop of Aberdeen at Cupar in Fife, on the 21st of September, 1768, by bishop Falconar, primus, assisted by bishops Raitt and Alexander⁴.

1769—1773.—FROM THIS period there is an entire dearth of intelligence of every sort during the primacy of bishop Falconar. It is to be recollected that bishops, clergy, and laity, were remorselessly proscribed, and the act of parliament was still in force that prohibited their congregational meetings entirely, and that only four persons could be legally present at divine service at one time, and that too only in the clergyman's own dwelling-house. To the honour of George the Third's memory, the provisions of this act were not very frequently enforced after his accession; yet the clergy were at the mercy of every eves-dropper that chose to prefer an information against them for any infringement of the statute. Then they were liable to fines that they could not pay, or to imprisonment;

¹ Vindication, 31, 32.

² Ibid. 42.

³ Ibid. 18, 19,

⁴ Primitive Truth, &c. App. 523.—List, &c. 39.—Skinner, ii. 683.—Perceval's Apology, 255.

to banishment for life to the plantations, with the penalty of *ath*, should they venture to return. Thus the vineyard of the Lord was laid desolate; her hedge was broken down, and they that passed by plucked off her grapes. The wild boar of the wood rooted it up, and the wild beasts of the field devoured it. To the eye of man there was no appearance of the Lord of Hosts turning again, and looking down in mercy from heaven to behold and visit this vine and the place of the vineyard that His right hand had planted. Nevertheless, He preserved a faithful witness, "a remnant" that still "kept the faith;" and even that schism, which was a grievous sin in the participators, was turned in the end to His glory, for it reserved the laity in *nominal* connection with the church, so as to bring them eventually within its sacred enclosures.

ABOUT THIS TIME, Dr. Trail, bishop of Down and Connor, who was then on a pleasure tour through Scotland, so far forgot the unity of the church and his duty to her, as schismatically to ordain Mr. William Laing in Peterhead, in the very town where bishop Kilgour, the bishop of the diocese, had his residence and pastoral charge. Mr. Laing was ordained for the independent, or, as it was called, the *English* chapel in that place. The greater number of the episcopalians deserted the church on account of the civil disabilities to which they were subjected, and joined those independent and isolated congregations that had no mutual communion or corporate government. In the same year the bishop of Down and Connor admitted Mr. Charles Cordiner to the order of priesthood, as he passed through the town of Arbroath. Mr. Cordiner had been ordained deacon the preceding year by Dr. Newton, bishop of Bristol¹. Dr. Trail seems to have been a most unworthy successor to Jeremy Taylor. In these ordinations he broke the canons of the Council of Antioch in the year 341, one of which ordains, "Let not a bishop go into another city or district, not pertaining to him, *to ordain any one*, or to appoint any presbyters or deacons to places subject to another bishop, unless with the *consent* of the proper bishop of the district. *any one dare* to do otherwise, let the ordination be invalid, and himself punished by the synod²." And another ordains, "Let no bishop go from one province to another, to ordain any in the churches to the dignity of the liturgy, though he have others with him, except he be invited by the letters of the metropolitan, and the bishops that are with him, and to regu-

¹ Skinner's Annals, pp. 173 and 242.

² Perceval's Roman Schism, canon xxii. p. 39.

late ecclesiastical matters which do not concern him, when nobody calls him, all is *null* that is done by him; and he is to suffer proper punishment for his irregularity and unreasonable enterprise, as being deposed forthwith by the holy synod¹."

FOR MANY YEARS the registers of the General Assemblies present nothing besides the records of the king's gracious letters by his representatives the commissioners, and the Assembly's dutiful replies. A mortal struggle was carried on betwixt the enemies of patronage and the Assemblies, with their Commissions. The Scots Magazine contains many extraordinary scenes that were enacted at the induction of ministers; and the accounts of parishes remaining *vacant for many years* during the contentions of presentees and patrons with the sovereign people. One instance may be mentioned where the parish was *seven years* without a minister. Mr. Thomson, minister of Garguunoch, was presented by the patron to the parish of St. Ninian's, near Stirling. The parish had been excited to oppose his settlement, and no one could be found to sign the document named a "*call*," which is a species of fiction purporting to be a popular election, and is a sort of winking at *patronage*—a compromise betwixt the *divine right* of the people to choose their own ministers, and the devil's invention of patronage. It was absolutely necessary that this equivocal call should be signed by somebody, and, therefore, to preserve the dignity of the kirk, some good-natured episcopalian signed it. As it is a mere form, this was held sufficient by the Assembly, to whom Mr. Thomson had appealed from the presbytery which refused to induct him. A running fight was kept up in a circle from the presbytery to the synod, from that court to the Assembly and back again, for seven years; but at last, in the year 1773, the Assembly signed a peremptory order, or "*act of transportability*," to the presbytery of Stirling to proceed without delay to the induction of Mr. Thomson, and for every member of the presbytery to be present. The induction could now no longer be evaded, therefore the presbytery assembled at the parish church of St. Ninian's, and, as usual, it is the duty of the *youngest* minister to officiate. After the sermon that precedes the act of settlement, instead of asking the routine of questions usual on these occasions, in conformity with their formula, Mr. Findlay, of Dollar, the moderator, addressed himself to the presentee as follows:—"We are met

¹ Antiochian, can. xiii. cited by Rev. F. A. Glover in his *Figmentum papale* page 77.

here this day to admit you minister of St. Ninian's. There has been a formidable opposition made against you by six hundred heads of families, sixty heritors, and all the elders of the parish except one. This opposition has continued *seven years* by your own obstinacy; and if you should this day be admitted, you can have no pastoral relation to the souls of this parish; you will never be regarded as the shepherd to go before the sheep; they know you not, and they will never follow you. You will draw misery and contempt upon yourself; you will be despised; you will be hated; you will be insulted and maltreated. One of the most eloquent and learned ministers of this church told me lately that he would go twenty miles to see you deposed; and I do assure you that I and twenty thousand more friends to our church would do the same. What happiness can you propose to yourself in this mad, this desperate attempt of yours, without the concurrence of the people, and without the least prospect of usefulness in this parish? Your admission into it can only be regarded as a sinecure, and you yourself as the stipend-lifter of St. Ninians, for you can have no further relation to this parish. Now, sir, I conjure you, by the mercies of God, give up this presentation; I conjure you, for the sake of the great number of souls of St. Ninians, who are like sheep going astray without a shepherd to lead them, and who will never submit to you, give it up; I conjure you by that peace of mind which you would wish in a dying hour, and that awful and impartial account which in a little you must give to God, of your own soul and the souls of this parish, at the tribunal of the Lord Jesus Christ, give it up." A momentary silence ensued after this speech, which shewed more of the malevolence of party spirit than of obedience to the will of a court which they affect to call their superiors. The presentee, thus baited in the midst of his whole assembled parishioners, to whom such infamous advice had been indirectly conveyed, took courage, and said—"I forgive you, sir, for what you have now said, and may God forgive you. Proceed to obey your superiors." This calm and temperate reply disconcerted the moderator, and he omitted all the forms and ceremonies usual at the inducting of a minister who has been already ordained. After a short pause, he said—"I, as moderator of the presbytery of Stirling, admit you, Mr. David Thomson, to be minister of the parish of St. Ninians, in the true sense and spirit of the late sentence of the General Assembly, and you are hereby admitted accordingly¹." With such scenes as the above, and

¹ Scots Magazine, xxxv. pp. 614, 615.

such advice thus given to the people, on such a solemn occasion, it cannot be surprising to find them preached into the anti-patronage ferment that produced the free kirk rebellion and secession in 1843.

HERESY IS NEVER stationary, but is ever proceeding from one false step to another. The seceders reaped an abundant harvest from the disputes about patronage, and of course they made it their business to foment the vulgar antipathy to the exercise of patronage in the minds of the people. It is one of the peculiarities of the calvinistic system to restrict the mercy of God in redemption to a chosen few ; hence the presbyterians have ever anathematised the doctrine of "*universal* redemption," upon the antiscriptural dogma that those only are *redeemed* by Christ who have been *predestinated to be saved*! Whereas redemption is universal, but salvation is conditional, depending on our *obedience*—"if ye will enter into life, keep the commandments." The seceders, according to their views of the divine economy, published "an act and testimony"¹ against the doctrine of universal redemption, and cautioned their elect against the charitable hope that those who were predestinated to condemnation could by any possibility be saved ; nay, the Confession of Faith asserts that God himself cannot alter their destiny, for they "are particularly and *unchangeably* designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it *cannot be either increased or diminished*"².

- 1774.—NOTWITHSTANDING the heavy affliction with which the church of Christ was visited, Mr. Skinner says "the main point of ecclesiastic constitution was watchfully looked to, and the episcopal order kept up as occasion served or necessity required. The decrease of clergy in some of the old districts, and some other disagreeable circumstances which now and then occurred, created vacancies in those places where either a bishop was not sought or could not for some time be had ; and such vacancies, when happening, were supplied with episcopal officers as they were applied for, according to the provision made before hand, for any emergency of that kind, by the 7th of the canons enacted in 1743, which were now received as the standing code of church discipline suited to our particular situation. But where no incidental hindrance or canonical objection intervened, every vacant district was provided with an ordinary as speedily and regularly as the circumstances of the case would admit³." The disagreeable

¹ Testimony of the Original Seceders. p. 61.

Westminster Confession of Faith, cap. iii. S. iv.

³ Eccl. Hist. ii. 682.

circumstances above alluded to were probably the intrusion of the Independent episcopal clergy, who stole into almost every town or populous place where the members of the church were numerous or influential, and by this means robbed the church of almost all the better classes and many of the inferior orders, through the safety which their English ordination procured to them in the public worship.

THE BISHOPRICK of Dunblane had remained vacant from the resignation of bishop White; for although Mr. Thomas Oglevie had been elected in 1744, by the clergy of that diocese, yet the bishops refused to consecrate him. Bishop Falconar sent this year a mandate to the clergy of that diocese to elect a bishop, and their choice fell on one of their own number, Mr. Charles Rose, who was incumbent of a chapel at Down, a village in the parish of Kilmadock and county of Perth. Mr. Rose was consecrated at Forfar, on St. Bartholomew's day, the 24th of August, by bishop Falconar the primus, assisted by bishops Raitt and Forbes, to the bishoprick of Dunblane¹.

1776.—THE VOICE of controversy, and the jarring of parties, were completely subdued, if not altogether crushed, by the pressure of the penal laws that were intended to *extirpate* the last lingering remains of the house of God. The Edinburgh clergy, who had hitherto been so factious and discontented, were now so far humbled by affliction as to solicit the primate, who lived in that city, for a mandate to elect an ordinary. They elected the primus himself, then bishop of Moray, who accepted the offer, and immediately took the oversight of that bishoprick. He then issued a mandate to his former diocese of Moray, to elect his intimate friend, Mr. Arthur Petrie, incumbent of the congregation of Micklefolla, in the diocese of Aberdeen, to be his coadjutor. Mr. Petrie was consecrated at Dundee, on the 27th of June, by bishop Falconar, the primus, assisted by bishops Raitt, Kilgour, and Rose².

BISHOP ALEXANDER, of Dunkeld, died this year, at Alloa, where he resided. "His reputation still lives in the church; and he continues to be spoken of by those who knew him as a person of apostolical simplicity, piety, and benevolence. The small chapel which is yet [1824] to be seen at Alloa [it is now no more to be seen, a new one has been built], was bequeathed by him to his successors in that town, as a proof at once of his frugality and of his good wishes. He was twenty-

¹ Skinner, ii. 683.—Prim. Truth and Order, App. 523.—List, &c. 39.—*cith*, 548.—Perceval, 255.

² *Ut supra*.

three years bishop of Dunkeld, and at length, in the year 1776, he died, as he had lived, in the faith and fear of God and in peace with all mankind¹. In speaking of this good man, bishop Walker recommends from his example, in the anecdote already given, the duty and benefit of catechising as the best species of preaching or teaching the young: "What I myself attempted," says bishop Walker, "and what I attained when I was minister of St. Peter's chapel in Edinburgh, I feel with sufficient force was every way imperfect; but I did catechise to a greater extent than had been usual for some time before, and I have had the most satisfactory proofs in occasional examples of the effect. Sometimes these proofs have been furnished by persons yet alive, and sometimes they have reached me in messages from the bed of death in distant lands. It is the minister's bounden duty to sow the seed, though he may never see the fruit; and if he do indeed sow and assiduously cultivate the sound seed, as our formularies he is directed, whether he see it or not, it will, by God's blessing, bring forth fruit to eternal life. Other duties of the pastoral office may lead to more popularity, but an efficient system of catechetical instruction will much more certainly lead to the practical influence of sound religion than any other public duty which the minister is required to perform, because, in effect, it tends to render all the other duties influential by the light of truth, which it is its especial object to impart, and by the practice of piety, which it is no less the special object of a full system of catechising to enforce, inferring, of necessity, that divine aid, without which nothing is of any value²."

IN THE BEGINNING of this year, the royal exile, James Francis Edward, died at Rome, in the eighty-eighth year of his age; the last six of which he was confined to his chamber by ill health. He is commonly known in history by the titles of the Pretender and the Chevalier St. George. The former title was given him as a sort of compromise betwixt his friends and his political opponents. The former acquiesced in the title because they considered his pretensions good to the crown, of which he was born the undoubted heir, without any competitor, and whilst his father was in full and undisputed possession of it.

1777.—BISHOP PETRIE was consecrated as coadjutor to the primus in the bishoprick of Moray; but the latter resigned

¹ Keith's Catalogue, App. 539, 540.

² Note E. to Charge to the Dioceses of Edinburgh and Glasgow, 1833, p. 47.

to see this year in his favour, and he became the sole bishop of Moray. Bishop Forbes died this year, at Leith, where he usually resided. Upon this event there was not any new consecration, but the oversight of the dioceses of Ross, Caithness, and Orkney, was committed to the spiritual care of bishop Petrie. This year also bishop Raitt, of Brechin, died at Dundee, on the 13th of January¹. By the death of the late William Smith, one of the episcopal clergy of Aberdeen, John Skinner was removed from the village of Ellon to the city. At this period the congregation to which he was appointed amounted to about 300, and it met in the upper room of a dwelling-house. In the course of a year it increased so much that additional accommodation was required; but, as his son and biographer, in 1776, even the idea of erecting an ostensible church-like place of worship dared not be cherished by Scotch episcopalians. Hence was Mr. Skinner obliged to look out for some retired situation, down a close or the alley, and there, at his own individual expense, to erect a large dwelling-house; the two upper floors of which being fitted up as a chapel, were devoted to the accommodation of a daily increasing flock, and the two under floors to the residence of his family².

1778.—ON THE DEATH of bishop Raitt, the clergy of the diocese of Brechin elected Mr. George Innes, who ministered in the upper room of a dwelling-house, to a congregation in Aberdeen. That “spacious” meeting-house that Wodrow mentions, having been built at Aberdeen by contributions from England, was probably pulled down by the duke of Cumberland’s orders, when he devastated the north, before the action of Culloden³. Mr. Innes was consecrated at Alloa, Clackmananshire, on August the 13th, by bishop Falconar, the *primus*, assisted by bishops Rose of Dunblane, and Petrie of Moray. He was collated, at the same time, to the spiritual superintendence of the bishoprick of Brechin⁴.

IT MIGHT BE evident to the presbyterians themselves, that there must be a defect in their system,—“something rotten in the state of” presbytery,—that makes its course ever to run a succession of corruptions. Its own sons are continually mentioning the corruptions in its doctrines, and the aggravated uncleanness in its practice of morality. Under this year, its best historian bears testimony to this singular failing in its

¹ Skinner’s Ecclesiastical History, ii. 683.

² Memoir of Bishop Skinner, prefixed to Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, p. 16, 17.

³ *Ante*, vide Ch. lxii. p. 183.

⁴ Skinner, ii. 683.—Keith, App. 545.—List, &c. 40.—Perceval, 255.

system:—"The stream of *corruption* rolled on," he says, "*widening and deepening* as it swept along, for several successive years. During that time, repeated instances occurred in which accusations of heresy were quashed or explained away, and charges of immorality mitigated, smoothed over, and dismissed. Some cases, however, occurred, too public and enormous to be thus passed by. To meet such painful cases, the moderate leaders resorted to a new device. They entered into a private arrangement with the delinquent, according to which he agreed to accept a pension out of the stipend, to withdraw from the parish, and to permit an assistant to be appointed to discharge those duties which public decency would no longer suffer him to desecrate. This was called 'mercy to a weak and erring brother;' what was it to the feelings of the disgusted community?—what to the pillaged assistant?—what to the purity of the church of Christ? *Many* such cases might be mentioned from the earliest recorded instance during the domination of Principal Robertson, down till the loss of power by that party from whose corrupt policy they originated; but we forbear, under a strong feeling of shame and regret that such things could be done by men who were, at least *nomi- nally*, christian ministers¹."

1779-1782.—ON ACCOUNT of his advanced age, and many infirmities of body, bishop Falconar resigned the office of primus, and the bishops immediately elected the bishop of Aberdeen to be his successor in office. This fact I do not find mentioned in any of my references; but I give it on the authority of a private communication from the present bishop of St. Andrews.

DURING THESE YEARS the kingdom was convulsed by tumults occasioned by some relaxation of the penal laws against the papists. These laws were forced upon the parliaments of the three kingdoms in self-defence and for self-preservation, in order to abridge the political power of the church of Rome, which has ever proved herself an irreconcilable enemy to pure religion and to rational liberty. The laws against popery, enacted in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. in England, with the Test Act in the reign of Charles II., extinguished the hopes of the papists to acquire political power and ascendancy in the state at that time. But the relaxation of these acts at different times, and the political privileges that have been conceded to them, have been most ungratefully used only as stepping-stones to farther encroachments; and the mad

¹ Hetherington's History, p. 222.

concessions of our own times have sufficiently shewn the national sin of bidding good speed to a system of the most unmitigated *IDOLATRY* that ever disgraced and debased rational beings; and therefore it is *at enmity with God*.

SOME ATTEMPTS had been made, at various times, in the General Assembly, to abolish the signing of the Westminster Confession of Faith, chiefly, it would appear, by the ministers who taught Socinian doctrines. This was opposed by the more orthodox leaders in the Assembly, not, however, so vigorously but that the Socinian party might have eventually triumphed, had not an unexpected ally come to their assistance. A number of the heritors, who hold the purse-strings, met and drew up some resolutions, in which they declared that the moment the kirk abandoned the signing of the Westminster Confession they would consider its connection with the state to be at an end, *and would, therefore, pay no more stipend*. This was an intelligible argument, which overturned all others, and therefore the project was at that time abandoned, to be reproduced in our own days. In the General Assembly, as in all republics, the whole power of this democratic body ultimately resides in the person of one man. The history of the General Assemblies shews a succession of these *leaders*, as they are called. The superior genius of Carstairs guided all their decisions during his lifetime; he was succeeded by Principal Robertson, the historian of Charles V., who in his turn gave place to Principal Hill, of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, who began his headship in the year 1781; and he was succeeded by Dr. John Inglis, of the Greyfriars kirk, who was, perhaps, one of the greatest men that the kirk has produced; whose able "*Vindication of Ecclesiastical Establishments*" the late bishop Walker pronounced "*calm, candid, and convincing*." The struggle for the leadership, which ended in the "*Disruption*," commenced at his death. Notwithstanding the popular constitution of all the presbyterian courts, yet there must be a last resort in each of them, as in all other democratic bodies; there must be an arbitrary, an absolute, and an unaccountable power lodged somewhere, and that power is usually wielded by the man of greatest abilities, who fights his way to the summit through intrigue and the ambition of others, by the force of his talents; but above all, by his long, loud, and plausible *talking*. Not so in the church and in a monarchical government. There it is the office which is of divine appointment, let the holder of it be ever so weak or wicked, that is the ultimate resort, the head and chief respectively in their different monarchies.

CHAPTER LXXIV.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. ROBERT KILGOUR,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1782.—Election of a coadjutor.—Bishop Skinner's consecration.—1783.—No bishops in the colonies.—Church in America.—Efforts made for bishops.—State of the American church.—Political difficulties in conferring orders.—Offer of the Danish establishment—its defect.—1784.—Dr. Seabury elected.—New difficulties.—The oath of allegiance.—Inquiries after the church of Scotland.—A correspondence opened with bishop Kilgour.—Dr. Seabury's consecration.—1785.—Dr. Seabury's return—meets his clergy—their address—and recognition.—Bishop Seabury's reply—his consecration noticed in *Gentleman's Magazine*—a controversy in it.—A letter from a Scottish clergyman.—1786.—Archdeacon Horsley.—Letter to bishop Kilgour from bishop Lowth.—The primus resigns the bishoprick of Aberdeen.—1787.—A coadjutor consecrated for bishop Petrie.—Bishop Petrie's death.—Bishop Jolly's funeral sermon—a notice of his life.—Church in Connecticut—in the other states.—A representative body.—Consecration of bishops Provoost and White—and of bishops Strachan and Abernethy Drummond.—1788.—Death of prince Charles Edward—Mr. Greathead's interview with him—character.—Change of position in the church—resolution to tender their allegiance to George III.—An episcopal synod.—Orders given for prayers for the king.—Letters to the secretary of state and his answer, and to the archbishops.—Resignation of the primacy by bishop Kilgour.—Catholic church in America.—Remarks.

1784.—BISHOP KILGOUR, the new primus, was “a man of uncommon benignity of mien and manner, and of the greatest private worth but the duties of the office, as he advanced in life, proving too great for his naturally delicate frame, he, with the unanimous consent of his clergy, applied to the episcopal college for a bishop coadjutor to him in his extensive diocese¹.” The other prelates cheerfully agreed to the primus's request, and the clergy of the diocese accord-

¹ *Memoirs of Bishop John Skinner*, p. 19.

gly elected the rev. Mr. John Skinner to be their ordinary's adjutor. There being no chapel or place of worship, separate from a dwelling-place in Aberdeen, at that time, and there being danger of legal interruption, may have been the inducement for bishop Kilgour to hold the consecration of his distinguished coadjutor in the remote chapel of Luthermuir, so far from Laurencekirk, in the diocese of Brechin. This chapel, "far in a wild, remote from human view," had probably escaped the notice of the duke of Cumberland's army during the reign of military law, and had therefore not been burnt or dilapidated. Here bishop Kilgour, the prior, assisted by bishop Rose of Dunblane, and bishop Strickland of Moray, consecrated Mr. John Skinner, presbyter, his own coadjutor in the bishoprick of Aberdeen, on the 25th September¹.

1783.—IT HAS UNHAPPILY never been the policy of England to send out a full ecclesiastical establishment with her colonies. This has been a great national sin, and it will be more tolerable, in the day of judgment, for France, Spain, and Portugal, than for her, for they sent out a complete church to every colony which they planted. As a sort of dignified security, the bishop of London was considered the diocesan of all the American parochial churches; but it is evident that his jurisdiction would be merely nominal. Their only mode of obtaining clergymen was by emigration from home of those who had difficulty in obtaining promotion in England, or by sending candidates for the ministry to the mother country, attended with great expense, risk, and delay. The church was also presented to the people in an imperfect form, and the apostolic rite of confirmation was unpractised and nearly unknown. In the reign of Charles II. measures were taken by the American colonies to obtain an episcopate; they were revived after the Revolution, but William of Orange "cared for none of these things;" queen Anne made some movement towards it, but the Lutheran house of Hanover were too much engrossed with German politics to feel much interest in our transatlantic colonies. Notwithstanding the cold indifference of the mother country, the church continued to advance. Timothy Cutlar, rector, and Mr. Samuel Johnson, tutor, at Yale College, both congregational ministers, became convinced of the invalidity of their ministry, and proceeded to England, where they were admitted into holy orders. On

Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 683.—List, &c. 40.—Prim. Truth, &c. p. 523.—Skinner's Annals, 19.—Perceval, 255.

their return, Dr. Cutlar was preferred to Christ Church, Boston, and Mr. Johnson was settled in Connecticut, as the missionary from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. This latter gentleman, by his controversial writings, succeeded in awakening general attention in Connecticut to the question of episcopacy; and about the year 1763, applications for a bishop were renewed.

ARCHBISHOP SECKER, with some other bishops, were earnest and indefatigable with the administration for the appointment of one or more bishops for the American colonies; but party spirit was running high, and that plague-spot upon the church, the senseless fear of offending the dissenters, but which will not stand the scrutiny of the great and terrible day of the Lord, made this good work be put off till a more convenient season, which, like king Agrippa's repentance, never arrived. In a letter to Horace Walpole, archbishop Secker says,—“ I believe there scarce is, or ever was, a bishop of the church of England, from the Revolution to this day, that hath not desired the establishment of bishops in our colonies. Archbishop Tennison, who was surely no high churchman, left by his will £1000 towards it, and many more, of the greatest eminence, might be named, who were and are zealous for it.” As his last service in a cause that he had so zealously advocated, archbishop Secker bequeathed £1000 towards the establishment of a bishop or bishops in the King's dominions in America. The rebellion in America set this good work aside, under the pretence of waiting till the rebellion was subdued. Had bishops been established in these colonies, it is more than probable that they might have been preserved in their allegiance to the crown of Great Britain. Immediately after the separation of the colonies, and they had assumed their present designation of the United States of America, the destruction of the church seemed, in all human estimation, to be inevitable. The fostering hand to which the American church owed, under divine providence, a long continuance of care and protection, was withdrawn, and the Propagation Society no longer rendered its accustomed aid. Many of the clergy were thus left entirely destitute, and some were obliged to betake themselves to secular employments for daily bread. Many of the clergy refused to repudiate their allegiance to their sovereign, and therefore quitted the States rather than profess allegiance to the new republic. The new American government adopted the system of sacrilege from the old country, and confiscated the revenues and glebes of the clergy; whilst, says Mr. Caswall, “ episcopalians in general became subject

to unmerited and cruel political prejudices. Most of their churches were destitute of worshippers; their clergy had departed, or were left almost entirely without maintenance; no centre of unity remained, and no ecclesiastical government existed." With the earnest appeals of the British government, which Mr. Hawkins has published, he writes, "it cannot be said that the heads of the English church were indifferent to the claims of their American brethren, or backward to maintain them. But political and sectarian feeling combined to thwart the plans of the church, till the independence of the States had been established, when the question of episcopacy became, with the republicans, a matter of secondary importance. The same objections were no longer entertained to the introduction of bishops. The only difficulty, herefore, that remained, was for the several conventions to agree upon the time and manner of seeking the episcopate. The middle and southern states were for delay—'Let us first gather together our scattered members.' The language of the east and north was wiser—'Let us first have a head to us, and then we shall be better enabled to find our members.' Ultimately, in 1783, the clergy of Connecticut elected DR. SAMUEL SEABURY, many years a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel on Long Island, and commended him to the bishops of the English church for consecration¹."

NOTWITHSTANDING the difficulties with which the American church was beset, her members did not despair, but called to remembrance the promise of her divine Head, of protection and support against all the efforts of the "gates of hell." Soon after the cessation of hostilities, several gentlemen embarked for England, and applied to Dr. Lowth, then bishop of London, for orders; but a difficulty occurred in the new and independent position of the United States. The oath of allegiance required by candidates for holy orders could not consistently be taken by an American *citizen*. Dr. Lowth therefore applied to parliament for an act to enable him to dispense with the oath usually taken by British subjects. In the meantime, the Danish establishment declared their willingness to assist the American church, and to admit candidates to the ministry on condition of their signing such of the Thirty-nine Articles of the church of England as are purely theo-

¹ Documents relative to the Erection and Endowments of additional Bishops in the Colonies.—Caswall's History of the American Episcopal Church, vol. i.

logical. Happily, the American clergy declined this well-meant and kind offer; for it must be said, with sorrow, that although they have nominally the three orders of the ministry, yet they have not the apostolical succession. This was communicated to Mr. Perceval by the late bishop of Edinburgh, in a letter dated September 13, 1833—"The church of Norway and Denmark is similar in all respects [to that of Sweden, being Lutheran, and of course maintaining consubstantiation], though most unfortunately *deficient* in that most important point, *the episcopal succession*, which was so little known, that Dr. Seabury, when he failed to obtain consecration in England, was actually in treaty with the bishop of Zeeland. He was better directed to our then almost unknown church: and this direction was given by Lowth, then bishop of London; and I have very lately heard that the venerable president Routh was the means of directing bishop Lowth to our bishops¹." This is further confirmed by Dr. Low, bishop of Ross and Argyle, who cites part of a letter from bishop Luscombe, dated Paris, July, 1826, who says—"All doubt is therein [Münter's Hist. of the Reformation in Denmark] removed by a statement, that 'after the appearance of a work by Bügenhagen, a disciple of Luther, the attention of the nation was directed towards the formation of a church on the principles of protestantism. The king, in the place of bishops, archdeacons, and deans, nominated *superintendents*, and for the purpose of their consecration they applied to Bügenhagen, who was himself a superintendent at Wirtemberg. On the 12th of August, 1537, Bügenhagen crowned the king and queen; and on the 2d of September the same year, he consecrated the new evangelical superintendents.' . . . The kirk in Denmark, then," says bishop Low, "seems exactly similar to our own in Scotland from the time of the Reformation down to the year 1610, when we received regular consecration from the church in England²."

1784.—THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT consented to the request of bishop Lowth, and the candidates, amounting, says Dr. Chandler, to fifty-two, were ordained, and returned to their own land, with the exception of ten that died before they reached home³. In the preceding year, the clergy of Connecticut elected Dr. Samuel Seabury to be their bishop, and commended him to the bishops in England for consecration. Dr.

¹ Cited in Perceval's Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833, 2d edit. p. 67. 1843.

² Collection. &c. 66.

Cited by Mr. Hawkins.

Seabury had been for many years a missionary of the Propagation Society in Long Island, Mr. Caswall says, on Staten Island; where his services had been so important that the University of Oxford conferred on him the honorary degree of D.D., and for his able defence of the doctrine and constitution of the church of England. He brought to England the most ample testimonials of the respectability of his character, and of his fitness for the high office to which he had been elected. His testimonials were quite satisfactory to the archbishop of Canterbury, to whom indeed his character had been previously known; "but he felt a delicacy about complying with their prayer, both because the bishop elect had not been chosen by the whole church of the United States, and because government was unwilling to sanction such a step till they had ascertained in what light it would be viewed by the now independent states." Two exceedingly silly reasons, if true; for the country of Connecticut was a church in itself, and had been unanimous in his election, and if we wait till the scruples, the enmity, and the opposition of men of this world, are removed, we should wait for ever. St. Paul made no inquiry in what light a more powerful government than a few revolted provinces was, or ever will be, would view his introducing bishops into its provinces or even into its capital itself. If he had, we should most likely now have been groping our way in heathen darkness. But the true reason was, the hitch of the oath of allegiance, which could not be got over without a greater loss of time than was convenient or prudent for Dr. Seabury to afford; for although it had been overlooked in the case of the ordination of priests, yet in the more important case of the consecration of a bishop it required a special act of parliament.

IT WAS NOW SUDDENLY recollected that there once had been a church in Scotland, and it was just possible that it might be there still, and have survived the persecuting acts of the British parliament. If it still existed there might yet be found balm in Gilead, and inquiries were set on foot to ascertain whether or not the Ark of God had found shelter in the wilderness and had been preserved. Fortunately for all concerned, Dr. Berkeley, a prebendary of Canterbury, was then residing at St. Andrews, and through his means a correspondence was opened betwixt Dr. Seabury and bishop Kilgour. The Scottish bishops entertained some natural fears for their own safety and the further preservation of the "little flock," of which they were the governors and conservators. The archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Moore, assured Dr. Seabury of the validity

of the Scottish orders, and that the only objection to those prelates was their political principles. But their politics could not be objectionable to men who had violently abjured that same allegiance at which these prelates only bore a scruple of conscience. The archbishop was also pleased to communicate to the Scottish primate through Dr. Berkeley that the consecration of Dr. Seabury would be so far from exciting any prejudice against them and their desolate church, that it would place both themselves and the opinion of their principles in a more favourable light. Taking courage, therefore, and being besides impatient of any further delay, Dr. Seabury proceeded to Scotland in the autumn of this year; and on the 14th of November, 1784, being Sunday, he was publicly consecrated at Aberdeen by bishop Kilgour, *primus*, bishop Petrie, and bishop Skinner¹.

1785.—“EARLY IN THE SUMMER of the ensuing year he returned to Connecticut, the first bishop of any church,” says Mr. Hawkins, “that had yet been seen in the whole of the North American continent.” “Thus, at length,” says Mr. Caswall, “an American bishop had been obtained; and the church in one State appeared in a complete form. But what was necessary in Connecticut was equally necessary in other regions; and although episcopalians generally respected the new bishop, and few alleged any thing against the validity of his episcopacy, they still thought it most proper to direct their views towards that country from which they derived their origin as a people and as a church.” Bishop Seabury only presided at one consecration in America, when, assisted by bishops White and Maddison, he consecrated Dr. Thomas Claggett to the bishoprick of Maryland in New York, on the 17th of September, 1792².

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE of Connecticut assembled at Middletown on the 3d of August, and presented an address to their bishop, from which the following are some extracts:—“Devoutly do we adore and reverently thank the Great Head of the Church, that he has been pleased to preserve you through a long and dangerous voyage; that He has crowned your endeavours with success, and now at last permits us to enjoy, under you, the long and ardently desired blessing of a pure, valid, and free episcopacy—a blessing which we receive as the precious gift of God himself. . . . Whatever can be done by us for the

¹ Skinner, ii. 685.—List for America, 40.—Perceval, 255.—Mr. Hawkins Documents, &c.—Caswall's History of the American Episcopal Church.

² Caswall's History, &c.—An American Almanack.

advancement of so good a work shall be done with united attention, and the exertion of our best abilities; and as you are now by our voluntary and united suffrages, (signified to you first at New York in April 1784, by the Rev. Mr. Jarvis, and now ratified and confirmed in this present convention) elected bishop of that branch of the catholic and apostolic church to which we belong; we, in the presence of Almighty God, declare to the world, that we *do unanimously and voluntarily accept, receive, and recognise you* to be our bishop supreme in the government of the church, and in the administration of all ecclesiastical offices. And we do solemnly engage to render you all that respect, duty, and submission, which we believe to belong, and are due to your high office, and which we understand were given by the presbyters to their bishops in the primitive church, while, in her native purity, she was unconnected with, and uncontroled by, any secular power. . . . To this church [of England] was our immediate application directed, *earnestly requesting a bishop* to collect, govern, and continue our scattered, wandering, and sinking church: and *great* was, and still continues to be, *our surprise*, that a request so reasonable in itself, so congruous to the nature and government of that church, and begging for an officer so absolutely necessary in the church of Christ as they and we believe a bishop to be, *should be refused*. We hope that the successors of the apostles in England have sufficient reasons to *justify themselves to the world and to God*. *We, however, know of none such, nor can our imagination frame any*. But, blessed be God! another door was opened for you. In the mysterious economy of His providence he had preserved the remains of the old episcopal church of Scotland, under all the malice and persecutions of its enemies. In the school of adversity, its pious and venerable bishops had learned to renounce the pomps and grandeur of the world; and were ready to do the work of their heavenly Father. As outcasts they pitied us; as faithful holders of the apostolical commission, what they had *freely received* they *freely gave*. From them we have received a free, valid, and purely ecclesiastical episcopacy, are thereby made complete in all our parts, and have a right to be considered as a living, and, we hope, through God's grace, shall be a vigorous branch, of the catholic church. To these venerable fathers our sincerest thanks are due, and they have them most fervidly. May the Almighty be their rewarder, regard them in mercy, support them under the persecution of their enemies, and turn the hearts of their persecutors, and make their simplicity and godly sincerity known unto all men! And wherever the

American episcopal church shall be mentioned in the world, may this good deed which they have done for us be spoken of for a memorial of them¹ !”

IN HIS REPLY to this address, bishop Seabury said—“ . . . The surprise you express at the rejection of your application to England is natural. But when the ecclesiastical and civil constitutions are so closely woven together as they are in that country, the first characters in the church for station and merit may find their good dispositions rendered ineffectual by the intervention of the civil authority. And whether it is better to submit quietly to this state of things in England, or to risk that confusion which would probably ensue should an amendment be attempted, demands serious attention. The sentiments you entertain of the venerable bishops in Scotland are highly pleasing to me. Their conduct through the whole business was candid, friendly, and christian ; appearing to me to arise from a just sense of duty, and to be founded in, and conducted by, the true principles of the apostolical church. And I hope you will join with me in manifestations of gratitude to them, by always keeping up the most intimate communion with them and their suffering church².”

BISHOP SEABURY'S consecration is mentioned in a periodical of the time as a “ remarkable anecdote,” in these words:—“ In November last, the rev. Dr. Seabury, a D.D. of Oxford, formerly a persecuted American missionary, after having applied in vain to the English bench of bishops with the most honourable credentials, was consecrated *bishop of Connecticut in partibus infidelium*, by the Episcopal College of Aberdeen, or, in other words, the five non-juring Scotch prelates, who have regularly kept up and continued their succession in that kingdom ever since episcopacy was abolished. This event, productive as it must be of important consequences (strange to say!) has never been mentioned in any of our papers. Whether this first American prelate will apply or not, and with what success, for the large sums bequeathed by archbishops Tennison and Secker, and bishop Benson, towards the establishment and support of episcopacy on that continent, time must show³.” The writer of this “ remarkable

¹ The Address of the Episcopal Clergy of Connecticut to the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury, with his Answer, and a Sermon by the Rev. Jeremiah Leaming, M.A. Rector of Christ Church, Stratford ; also Bishop Seabury's first Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, both delivered at Middletown, August, 3d and 4th, 1785, with a List of the Succession of Scots Bishops, from the Revolution in 1688 to the present time, 1786, p. 3 to 6. ² Ibid. 7, 8.

³ Gentleman's Magazine, Feb. 1785, vol. lv. 105.

anecdote" was answered in the April number, by one, who says,—“ Bishop Seabury is gone to Connecticut unfettered by any of our English laws, either ecclesiastical or secular, many of which are derogatory, and even destructive, so far as they are permitted to operate, of the unalienable rights of episcopacy and of the church, as a spiritual society. Nor can he claim these legacies as a matter of right, since by statute 21 Geo. II. ch. xxiv. s. 13, so far as an *act of state* can produce such an effect, all ecclesiastical orders conferred by Scotch bishops are rendered *null and void*. And though it is true that the English-established bishops did refuse to grant to America the blessings of episcopacy in the person of Dr. Seabury, and thereby drove him to seek it where (*horribile dictu*), accounting to a most unchristian statute, which will always leave *an indelible scandal* upon the English church, his consecration will not by the establishment be allowed *valid*; on this, and such-like grounds of state, laws so far interfering with matters purely spiritual as to interdict and annihilate, as far as they can, the very essential and unalienable rights and powers of the christian church as a spiritual society, Papists and presbyterians, and every other sect of anti-episcopalians, have long, and, it must be confessed, too justly, reproached the established religion of this country, as being little better than a mere creation of the civil state¹.”

THE FIRST NOTICE of this consecration, as before cited, had called up the venom of another writer of a different stamp, in the March number, who signs L. L. It is evidently the result of dissenting malice, on whichever side of the Tweed it may have been written. In the spirit of the most malignant hatred of the church, and at the same time of the most profound ignorance, the writer demands,—“ How came the *anonymous* Scotch bishop who publishes the consecration sermon, on his own title, or, if he had one, how he could confer it on another, *without the authority* of his sovereign?” A Mr. Michael Woodhull, also, in a note annexed to some poems, had a sarcastic sneer at the bishop of Connecticut's consecration, as *a pretended* consecration by a *junto* of non-juring Scotch ecclesiastics, assuming to themselves the episcopal office².” The intolerant remarks of L. L. were answered by a clergyman of that church, whose orders had been declared null and void. It is as follows:—

¹ Gentleman's Magazine, lv. 248.

² Cited in Daubeny's Guide to the Church, ii. 34. 2d edition, 1804.

“ ——— HAD THAT gentleman been sent across the Atlantic for no other purpose than to propagate in the new world vice and infidelity, his mission could not have excited in the breast of a good man greater indignation than Dr. Seabury's advancement to the episcopal dignity by the Scottish prelates seems to have raised in the intolerant breast of your correspondent. . . . While the colonies continued subject to the mother country, the Scotch bishops did not interfere, in any manner, either with their civil or their ecclesiastical affairs; for such interference they were sensible there was no occasion. The episcopalians of British America were supplied with clergymen by the bishops of that church which has hitherto been, and which, in spite of the revilings of anonymous scribblers, it is hoped will continue to be, ‘ the glory of the Reformation.’ Even after the colonies were declared independent, and were as alien from Great Britain as Japan and China, the prelates in Scotland, whom your correspondent would fain represent as the most aspiring of men, did not *volunteer* in the cause of episcopacy; they did not send into any of the United States one of *their own body*, to take upon himself the ecclesiastical government of that state; they well knew that they were looked upon with a jealous eye, and therefore they cautiously avoided a measure which might have awakened the dormant rage of their numerous enemies. But when a clergyman from Connecticut, warmly recommended by his brethren in that province, requested them to invest him with the episcopal character, they did not imagine that, by complying with his request, they should give to any man greater offence than the presbyterian ministers of Scotland or England had given, by *sending* into America missionaries of *their* order. Over the state of Connecticut the Scotch bishops were never so absurd as to claim any kind of jurisdiction; but to have *refused* to confer upon a clergyman of that state a character which in their opinion is essential to the very being of a church, would have been to circumscribe, as much as they could, the limits of their great Master's vineyard. . . .

“ ‘ THE LAWS OF SCOTLAND,’ however, says your correspondent, ‘ have excluded all episcopacy;’ and therefore he seems to think that there can be now no bishop on the north of the Tweed. But if the office of a bishop was instituted by the apostles, and, that it was, the Scotch non-jurors think there is abundant evidence, I am humbly of opinion that it cannot be ‘ excluded’ by any human legislature; nor do I think it

fear that any power inherent in the office can be taken away by any authority but that by which it was originally given. The Scotch convention, which voted episcopacy a *grievance*, might likewise have voted christianity a grievance, and have established the religion of Mahomet in its stead; but christianity would not, in consequence of that vote, have become a false, nor Ishmaelitism a true religion: an Act of Convention could not have made the Bible a collection of fables, nor the fictions of the Koran the truths of God. At the Revolution the Scotch bishops were deprived of their titles of honour, and of all *legal* jurisdiction, by an act of parliament, and for that deprivation an act of parliament was certainly competent; but the powers of preaching, of administering the sacraments, and of 'sending labourers into Christ's vineyard,' as they were received from no *human* authority, by no human authority could they be taken away. After their deprivation, they were, indeed, no longer peers of parliament . . . but they continued bishops of the catholic church as much as when possessed of their cathedrals and establishment. . . . 'The establishment of that country in which they are' *connived at* (or your correspondent *mistakes* when he supposes them to be *tolerated*;) the Scotch episcopalians treat with no other contempt' than what is necessarily implied in dissenting from . . . Although, like the church of England, they admit not of presbyterian orders, I do not think that the most intemperate of them had ever the insolence to compare that kind of ordination to 'the knighthood of Don Quixote,' or the ordainers to 'the Tempter making an offer of the kingdoms of this world, and the glory of them,' when 'he had no title even to a single acre,' or to brand the established minister, as this writer has branded 'most modern bishops,' with 'possessing, in an eminent degree, the wisdom of the serpent, though *not* that species of it recommended in scripture.' . . . That the framers of the law enacted in 1748 meant well, I shall not controvert; but the consequences of that law have *not* been beneficial. It was, no doubt, *intended* to crush disaffection to the government, but I know nothing which it has *really* crushed but *religion*, as it has driven out of the episcopal church many persons of consequence, whose principles or prejudices will not allow them to communicate with *another*. At the period when it was enacted, the species of disaffection which it was meant to eradicate was not confined to *one* denomination of christians; at present it has hardly a place among *any*; and the little that may remain, among a very few old people, an event daily to be expected, will certainly va-

nish. . . . I do not envy the English dissenters the liberty afforded them to worship God according to their consciences. May they long enjoy it! May they long deserve to enjoy it! for it is the undoubted right of every man. But while all sects (even such as 'deny the Lord who bought them') enjoy the privilege of a free toleration, I hope it will not be deemed improper repining, if I think it *hard* that the only denomination of protestants *excluded* from that privilege is a society which agrees with the church of England in doctrine, in discipline, and in worship¹."

1786.—THE MOST UNCHRISTIAN attack of the English dissenter, L. L., on the church of Scotland, and the able reply to it by the Scottish clergyman, attracted the notice of several distinguished men in the church of England, especially the *venerable* SAMUEL HORSLEY, archdeacon of St. Alban's, who was afterwards of such eminent service to the church of Scotland. Of this distinguished prelate a reviewer has said,—“The church of England, rich in great names, can boast of none higher than Horsley. As a divine, an adept in science, a philologist, and even as a parliamentary orator, his fame surpassed all contemporary eminence, and in some respects outshone even the splendour of the brightest geniuses which had thrown a lustre on the most happy periods of ecclesiastical scholarship².” The consecration of bishop Seabury was the means of commencing a correspondence betwixt bishop Skinner, and several eminent men in England, that was afterwards of essential service to the church of Scotland; and the primus received an anonymous letter, signed “A Dignified Clergyman of the Church of England,” informing him of the lately revived friendship of the Anglican church. Mr. Skinner concludes, from various circumstances, that the anonymous writer was Dr. Lowth, then bishop of London, who took this singular mode of communication. He writes,—“The consecration of Dr. Seabury by the Scotch bishops was an event which gave much pleasure to many of the most dignified and respectable amongst the English clergy, and to none more than to him who now has the honour to address you. A man who believes episcopacy, as I do, to be a divine institution, could not but rejoice to see it derived through so pure a channel to the western world. . . . The church of England, sir,

¹ Gentleman's Magazine for June, 1785. Vol. lv. 437-440. The letter was signed “An Episcopal Clergyman of the Scotch Church;” but it was written by the REV. GEORGE GLEIG, who was afterwards bishop of Brechin. The whole controversy was afterwards published in a pamphlet.

² Scottish Episcopal Magazine, ii. 580.

man well authorised to say, hath, of late years, looked on her
 in Scotland with a pitying eye. Many of our clergy
 regarded her as hardly dealt with, and wished for a repeal
 of those laws under which she now suffers. I have good rea-
 son to believe that there is an intention formed of endeavour-
 ing to do her some service at a convenient season; and I sin-
 cerely hope no circumstance will intervene to frustrate that
 intention¹."

FROM BODILY infirmities bishop Kilgour became unable to
 discharge his episcopal duties, and therefore in the month of
 October he resigned the administration of the diocese of Aber-
 deen to his coadjutor. Bishop Skinner was therefore invested
 with the entire superintendence of the diocese. Bishop Kil-
 gour, however, still continued to hold the office of Primus².
 This information is thus conveyed to the bishop of Connecticut
 by bishop Skinner himself:—"Bishop Kilgour deeming him-
 self too weak for the burthen of this diocese, resigned the
 whole charge of it into my hands, but still continues to act as
 primus, and I hope will yet be spared for some time with us³."

787.—As BISHOP PETRIE, of Moray, was at this time
 painfully struggling with a complication of bodily infirmi-
 ties, it was deemed proper to give him a coadjutor, at whose
 consecration he was providentially able to assist, about six
 weeks before his lamented death. The clergy of Moray and
 they elected Mr. Andrew Macfarlane presbyter of Inverness,
 who was accordingly consecrated in the primus's chapel at
 Perth, by bishop Kilgour, *primus*, assisted by bishops
 Petrie and Skinner, on the 7th of March⁴. Bishop Petrie
 died at Micklefolla on the 9th of April following, "to the
 great regret of this poor and desolate church, after a long and
 painful struggle with a complication of bodily infirmities⁵."

Jolly preached his funeral sermon, and described bishop
 Petrie as "one of the best men he ever knew." He says,—
 "Bishop Petrie certainly died the death of the righteous, be-
 cause he made it his constant business to live his life. . . . He
 went out early in the ways of holiness, and persevered in them
 to his latest breath, till he had fought the good fight, and
 shed his course. . . . At the same time, his humility and
 modesty of himself were so great, that it required no small
 degree of persuasion to prevail on him to enter into holy

Skinner's Annals, 60-64.

Keith's Catalogue, App. 534, 535.—Primitive Truth and Order, 524.

Annals, 68.

Annals, 67.—Primitive Truth, &c. 524.—Skinner, 687.—Keith, App.

Annals, 67.

logical. Happily, the American clergy declined this well-meant and kind offer; for it must be said, with sorrow, that although they have nominally the three orders of the ministry, yet they have not the apostolical succession. This was communicated to Mr. Perceval by the late bishop of Edinburgh, in a letter dated September 13, 1833—"The church of Norway and Denmark is similar in all respects [to that of Sweden, being Lutheran, and of course maintaining consubstantiation], though most unfortunately *deficient* in that most important point, *the episcopal succession*, which was so little known, that Dr. Seabury, when he failed to obtain consecration in England, was actually in treaty with the bishop of Zeeland. He was better directed to our then almost unknown church: and this direction was given by Lowth, then bishop of London; and I have very lately heard that the venerable president Routh was the means of directing bishop Lowth to our bishops¹." This is further confirmed by Dr. Low, bishop of Ross and Argyle, who cites part of a letter from bishop Luscombe, dated Paris, July, 1826, who says—"All doubt is therein [Münter's Hist. of the Reformation in Denmark] removed by a statement, that 'after the appearance of a work by Bügenhagen, a disciple of Luther, the attention of the nation was directed towards the formation of a church on the principles of protestantism. The king, in the place of bishops, archdeacons, and deans, nominated *superintendents*, and for the purpose of their consecration they applied to Bügenhagen, who was himself a superintendent at Wirtemberg. On the 12th of August, 1537, Bügenhagen crowned the king and queen; and on the 2d of September the same year, he consecrated the new evangelical superintendents.' . . . The kirk in Denmark, then," says bishop Low, "seems exactly similar to our own in Scotland from the time of the Reformation down to the year 1610, when we received regular consecration from the church in England²."

1784.—THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT consented to the request of bishop Lowth, and the candidates, amounting, says Dr. Chandler, to fifty-two, were ordained, and returned to their own land, with the exception of ten that died before they reached home³. In the preceding year, the clergy of Connecticut elected Dr. Samuel Seabury to be their bishop, and commended him to the bishops in England for consecration. Dr.

¹ Cited in Perceval's Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833, 2d edit. p. 67. 1843.

² Collection. 2c. 66.

Cited by Mr. Hawkins.

Seabury had been for many years a missionary of the Propagation Society in Long Island, Mr. Caswall says, on Staten Island; where his services had been so important that the University of Oxford conferred on him the honorary degree of D.D., and for his able defence of the doctrine and constitution of the church of England. He brought to England the most ample testimonials of the respectability of his character, and of his fitness for the high office to which he had been elected. His testimonials were quite satisfactory to the archbishop of Canterbury, to whom indeed his character had been previously known; "but he felt a delicacy about complying with their prayer, both because the bishop elect had not been chosen by the whole church of the United States, and because government was unwilling to sanction such a step till they had ascertained in what light it would be viewed by the now independent states." Two exceedingly silly reasons, if true; for the country of Connecticut was a church in itself, and had been unanimous in his election, and if we wait till the scruples, the enmity, and the opposition of men of this world, are removed, we should wait for ever. St. Paul made no inquiry in what light a more powerful government than a few revolted provinces was, or ever will be, would view his introducing bishops into its provinces or even into its capital itself. If he had, we should most likely now have been groping our way in heathen darkness. But the true reason was, the hitch of the oath of allegiance, which could not be got over without a greater loss of time than was convenient or prudent for Dr. Seabury to afford; for although it had been overlooked in the case of the ordination of priests, yet in the more important case of the consecration of a bishop it required a special act of parliament.

IT WAS NOW SUDDENLY recollected that there once had been a church in Scotland, and it was just possible that it might be there still, and have survived the persecuting acts of the British parliament. If it still existed there might yet be found balm in Gilead, and inquiries were set on foot to ascertain whether or not the Ark of God had found shelter in the wilderness and had been preserved. Fortunately for all concerned, Dr. Berkeley, a prebendary of Canterbury, was then residing at St. Andrews, and through his means a correspondence was opened betwixt Dr. Seabury and bishop Kilgour. The Scottish bishops entertained some natural fears for their own safety and the further preservation of the "little flock," of which they were the governors and conservators. The archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Moore, assured Dr. Seabury of the validity

of the Scottish orders, and that the only objection to those prelates was their political principles. But their politics could not be objectionable to men who had violently abjured that same allegiance at which these prelates only bore a scruple of conscience. The archbishop was also pleased to communicate to the Scottish primate through Dr. Berkeley that the consecration of Dr. Seabury would be so far from exciting any prejudice against them and their desolate church, that it would place both themselves and the opinion of their principles in a more favourable light. Taking courage, therefore, and being besides impatient of any further delay, Dr. Seabury proceeded to Scotland in the autumn of this year; and on the 14th of November, 1784, being Sunday, he was publicly consecrated at Aberdeen by bishop Kilgour, *primus*, bishop Petrie, and bishop Skinner¹."

1785.—"EARLY IN THE SUMMER of the ensuing year he returned to Connecticut, the first bishop of any church," says Mr. Hawkins, "that had yet been seen in the whole of the North American continent." "Thus, at length," says Mr. Caswall, "an American bishop had been obtained; and the church in one State appeared in a complete form. But what was necessary in Connecticut was equally necessary in other regions; and although episcopalians generally respected the new bishop, and few alleged any thing against the validity of his episcopacy, they still thought it most proper to direct their views towards that country from which they derived their origin as a people and as a church." Bishop Seabury only presided at one consecration in America, when, assisted by bishops White and Maddison, he consecrated Dr. Thomas Claggett to the bishoprick of Maryland in New York, on the 17th of September, 1792².

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE of Connecticut assembled at Middletown on the 3d of August, and presented an address to their bishop, from which the following are some extracts:—"Devoutly do we adore and reverently thank the Great Head of the Church, that he has been pleased to preserve you through a long and dangerous voyage; that He has crowned your endeavours with success, and now at last permits us to enjoy, under you, the long and ardently desired blessing of a pure, valid, and free episcopacy—a blessing which we receive as the precious gift of God himself. . . . Whatever can be done by us for the

¹ Skinner, ii. 685.—List for America, 40.—Perceval, 255.—Mr. Hawkins Documents, &c.—Caswall's History of the American Episcopal Church.

² Caswall's History, &c.—An American Almanack.

vancement of so good a work shall be done with united attention, and the exertion of our best abilities ; and as you are now by our voluntary and united suffrages, (signified to you at New York in April 1784, by the Rev. Mr. Jarvis, and now ratified and confirmed in this present convention) elected bishop of that branch of the catholic and apostolic church to which we belong ; we, in the presence of Almighty God, declare to the world, that we *do unanimously and voluntarily accept, receive, and recognise you* to be our bishop supreme in the government of the church, and in the administration of all ecclesiastical offices. And we do solemnly engage to render you all that respect, duty, and submission, which we believe belong, and are due to your high office, and which we understand were given by the presbyters to their bishops in the primitive church, while, in her native purity, she was unconnected with, and uncontrolled by, any secular power. . . . To this church [England] was our immediate application directed, *earnestly requesting a bishop* to collect, govern, and continue our scattered, wandering, and sinking church : and *great* was, and still continues to be, *our surprise*, that a request so reasonable in itself, so congruous to the nature and government of that church, and begging for an officer so absolutely necessary in the church of Christ as they and we believe a bishop to be, *could be refused*. We hope that the successors of the apostles in England have sufficient reasons to *justify themselves to the world and to God*. *WE, however, know of none such, nor can our imagination frame any*. But, blessed be God ! another door was opened for you. In the mysterious economy of His providence he had preserved the remains of the old episcopal church of Scotland, under all the malice and persecutions of its enemies. In the school of adversity, its pious and venerable bishops had learned to renounce the pomps and grandeur of the world ; and were ready to do the work of their heavenly Father. As outcasts they pitied us ; as faithful holders of the apostolical commission, what they had *freely received* they *freely gave*. From them we have received a free, valid, and truly ecclesiastical episcopacy, are thereby made complete in our parts, and have a right to be considered as a living, and, we hope, through God's grace, shall be a vigorous branch, of the catholic church. To these venerable fathers our sincerest thanks are due, and they have them most fervidly. May Almighty be their rewarder, regard them in mercy, support them under the persecution of their enemies, and turn the fruits of their persecutors, and make their simplicity and holy sincerity known unto all men ! And wherever the

American episcopal church shall be mentioned in the world, may this good deed which they have done for us be spoken of for a memorial of them¹ !”

IN HIS REPLY to this address, bishop Seabury said—“ . . . The surprise you express at the rejection of your application to England is natural. But when the ecclesiastical and civil constitutions are so closely woven together as they are in that country, the first characters in the church for station and merit may find their good dispositions rendered ineffectual by the intervention of the civil authority. And whether it is better to submit quietly to this state of things in England, or to risk that confusion which would probably ensue should an amendment be attempted, demands serious attention. The sentiments you entertain of the venerable bishops in Scotland are highly pleasing to me. Their conduct through the whole business was candid, friendly, and christian ; appearing to me to arise from a just sense of duty, and to be founded in, and conducted by, the true principles of the apostolical church. And I hope you will join with me in manifestations of gratitude to them, by always keeping up the most intimate communion with them and their suffering church².”

BISHOP SEABURY'S consecration is mentioned in a periodical of the time as a “remarkable anecdote,” in these words:—“ In November last, the rev. Dr. Seabury, a D.D. of Oxford, formerly a persecuted American missionary, after having applied in vain to the English bench of bishops with the most honourable credentials, was consecrated *bishop of Connecticut in partibus infidelium*, by the Episcopal College of Aberdeen, or, in other words, the five non-juring Scotch prelates, who have regularly kept up and continued their succession in that kingdom ever since episcopacy was abolished. This event, productive as it must be of important consequences (strange to say !) has never been mentioned in any of our papers. Whether this first American prelate will apply or not, and with what success, for the large sums bequeathed by archbishops Tennison and Secker, and bishop Benson, towards the establishment and support of episcopacy on that continent, time must show³.” The writer of this “remarkable

¹ The Address of the Episcopal Clergy of Connecticut to the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury, with his Answer, and a Sermon by the Rev. Jeremiah Leaming, M.A. Rector of Christ Church, Stratford ; also Bishop Seabury's first Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, both delivered at Middletown, August, 3d and 4th, 1785, with a List of the Succession of Scots Bishops, from the Revolution in 1688 to the present time, 1786, p. 3 to 6. ² Ibid. 7, 8.

³ Gentleman's Magazine, Feb. 1785, vol. lv. 105.

anecdote" was answered in the April number, by one, who says,—“ Bishop Seabury is gone to Connecticut unfettered by any of our English laws, either ecclesiastical or secular, many of which are derogatory, and even destructive, so far as they are permitted to operate, of the unalienable rights of episcopacy and of the church, as a spiritual society. Nor can he claim these legacies as a matter of right, since by statute 21 Geo. II. ch. xxiv. s. 13, so far as an *act of state* can produce such an effect, all ecclesiastical orders conferred by Scotch bishops are rendered *null and void*. And though it is true that the English-established bishops did refuse to grant to America the blessings of episcopacy in the person of Dr. Seabury, and thereby drove him to seek it where (*horribile dictu*), accounting to a most unchristian statute, which will always leave *an indelible scandal* upon the English church, his consecration will not by the establishment be allowed *valid*; on this, and such-like grounds of state, laws so far interfering with matters purely spiritual as to interdict and annihilate, as far as they can, the very essential and unalienable rights and powers of the christian church as a spiritual society, Papists and presbyterians, and every other sect of anti-episcopalians, have long, and, it must be confessed, too justly, reproached the established religion of this country, as being little better than a mere creation of the civil state¹.”

THE FIRST NOTICE of this consecration, as before cited, had called up the venom of another writer of a different stamp, in the March number, who signs L. L. It is evidently the result of dissenting malice, on whichever side of the Tweed it may have been written. In the spirit of the most malignant hatred of the church, and at the same time of the most profound ignorance, the writer demands,—“ How came the *anonymous* Scotch bishop who publishes the consecration sermon by his own title, or, if he had one, how he could confer it on another, *without the authority* of his sovereign?” A Mr. Michael Woodhull, also, in a note annexed to some poems, had a sarcastic sneer at the bishop of Connecticut's consecration, as *a pretended* consecration by a *junto* of non-juring Scotch ecclesiastics, assuming to themselves the episcopal office².” The intolerant remarks of L. L. were answered by a clergyman of that church, whose orders had been declared null and void. It is as follows:—

¹ Gentleman's Magazine, lv. 248.

² Cited in Daubeny's Guide to the Church, ii. 34. 2d edition, 1804.

nish. . . . I do not envy the English dissenters the liberty afforded them to worship God according to their consciences. May they long enjoy it! May they long deserve to enjoy it! for it is the undoubted right of every man. But while all sects (even such as 'deny the Lord who bought them') enjoy the privilege of a free toleration, I hope it will not be deemed improper repining, if I think it *hard* that the only denomination of protestants *excluded* from that privilege is a society which agrees with the church of England in doctrine, in discipline, and in worship ¹."

1786.—THE MOST UNCHRISTIAN attack of the English dissenter, L. L., on the church of Scotland, and the able reply to it by the Scottish clergyman, attracted the notice of several distinguished men in the church of England, especially the *venerable* SAMUEL HORSLEY, archdeacon of St. Alban's, who was afterwards of such eminent service to the church of Scotland. Of this distinguished prelate a reviewer has said,—“The church of England, rich in great names, can boast of none higher than Horsley. As a divine, an adept in science, a philologist, and even as a parliamentary orator, his fame surpassed all contemporary eminence, and in some respects outshone even the splendour of the brightest geniuses which had thrown a lustre on the most happy periods of ecclesiastical scholarship².” The consecration of bishop Seabury was the means of commencing a correspondence betwixt bishop Skinner, and several eminent men in England, that was afterwards of essential service to the church of Scotland; and the primus received an anonymous letter, signed “A Dignified Clergyman of the Church of England,” informing him of the lately revived friendship of the Anglican church. Mr. Skinner concludes, from various circumstances, that the anonymous writer was Dr. Lowth, then bishop of London, who took this singular mode of communication. He writes,—“The consecration of Dr. Seabury by the Scotch bishops was an event which gave much pleasure to many of the most dignified and respectable amongst the English clergy, and to none more than to him who now has the honour to address you. A man who believes episcopacy, as I do, to be a divine institution, could not but rejoice to see it derived through so pure a channel to the western world. . . . The church of England, sir,

¹ Gentleman's Magazine for June, 1785. Vol. lv. 437-440. The letter was signed “An Episcopal Clergyman of the Scotch Church;” but it was written by the REV. GEORGE GLEIG, who was afterwards bishop of Brechin. The whole controversy was afterwards published in a pamphlet.

² Scottish Episcopal Magazine, ii. 580.

well authorised to say, hath, of late years, looked on her in Scotland with a pitying eye. Many of our clergy regarded her as hardly dealt with, and wished for a repeal of the laws under which she now suffers. I have good reason to believe that there is an intention formed of endeavouring to do her some service at a convenient season; and I sincerely hope no circumstance will intervene to frustrate that design¹."

FROM BODILY infirmities bishop Kilgour became unable to discharge his episcopal duties, and therefore in the month of April he resigned the administration of the diocese of Aberdeen to his coadjutor. Bishop Skinner was therefore invested with the entire superintendence of the diocese. Bishop Kilgour, however, still continued to hold the office of Primus². Information is thus conveyed to the bishop of Connecticut by Bishop Skinner himself:—"Bishop Kilgour deeming himself too weak for the burthen of this diocese, resigned the charge of it into my hands, but still continues to act as coadjutor, and I hope will yet be spared for some time with us³."

—AS BISHOP PETRIE, of Moray, was at this time fully struggling with a complication of bodily infirmities, it was deemed proper to give him a coadjutor, at whose assistance he was providentially able to assist, about six months before his lamented death. The clergy of Moray and Aberdeenshire elected Mr. Andrew Macfarlane presbyter of Inverness, who was accordingly consecrated in the primus's chapel at Aberdeen, by bishop Kilgour, *primus*, assisted by bishops Skinner and Skinner, on the 7th of March⁴. Bishop Petrie died at Micklefolla on the 9th of April following, "to the regret of this poor and desolate church, after a long and arduous struggle with a complication of bodily infirmities⁵."

Bishop Petrie preached his funeral sermon, and described bishop Petrie as "one of the best men he ever knew." He says,—Bishop Petrie certainly died the death of the righteous, because he made it his constant business to live his life. . . . He was early in the ways of holiness, and persevered in them to his latest breath, till he had fought the good fight, and finished his course. . . . At the same time, his humility and modesty of himself were so great, that it required no small degree of persuasion to prevail on him to enter into holy orders.

¹ *Annals*, 60-64.

² *Annals*, App. 534, 535.—*Primitive Truth and Order*, 524.

³ *Annals*, 68.

⁴ *Annals*, 67.—*Primitive Truth*, &c. 524.—*Skinner*, 687.—*Keith*, App.

⁵ *Annals*, 67.

orders—the state for which God had designed him, and had so richly furnished him by His grace. Such a sense had he of the great weight and importance of the ministerial function, which he has been often heard to say, that nothing but the *great scarcity* of labourers, and *the necessities* of the church, could have prevailed upon him to undertake. . . . With this love to God above all, he had a great love to mankind, which necessarily springs from it, and he made it his constant business to promote the good of their souls and bodies. The church—the body and spouse of Christ—and its welfare, he had the most ardent zeal for; in the promoting of which he laid out the vigour of his mind, and the strength of his body. He went about doing good, journeying unweariedly, and without consideration of his bodily health, carried on beyond his strength, by the love he had to the interests of Christ's spiritual kingdom, the principle which alone actuated him. If that went well, he rejoiced in the midst of pain and bodily weakness. If any detriment or hurt seemed to threaten the church, no outward thing could make him cheerful. Indeed, the pleasures of the body he had so entirely got above, that I am very apt to think, such a *thorough conquest of them has been rarely seen* in these latter times; so well had he copied the example of the blessed apostle, who kept under his body, and brought it into subjection, lest by any means, when he preached to others, he himself should be a cast-away¹."

HIS FATHER was a respectable farmer in the parish of Forgue, in Aberdeenshire, and his mother was a sister of bishop Alexander. He studied at Aberdeen, but was indebted to his uncle for his theological acquirements. He was ordained deacon and priest in 1760, by bishop Gerard, of Aberdeen, and officiated as his curate for some time, till he was appointed to succeed Mr. Lunan at Micklefolla. But there being no place of worship, he rented a small farm from a worthy churchman, Mr. Leslie, of Rothie, on which he got a chapel erected at considerable labour and expense, where he officiated till the day of his death. The communion plate belonging to that congregation is now in the possession of the presbyterian minister of the parish, and there is an inscription on it—"To the *episcopal* congregation at Micklefolla;" which shews that the donor's *intention* has been completely frustrated by the sacrilege of the kirk. Bishop Alexander bequeathed his valuable library to him, which he removed to Micklefolla at

¹ Sermon by the Rev. Alexander Jolly, cited in note to the Rev. Mr. Prentley's Sermon, on occasion of the Death of Bishop Jolly, 22-24.

great expense, and it proved a great blessing to the church, for his house had become a seminary for the candidates for holy orders. The late bishop Jolly was amongst those who received the benefit of his teaching. From the scarcity of labourers, bishop Petrie officiated to two different congregations on the same day, at eight and ten miles distance from each other. "He was no less zealous and faithful in the discharge of his episcopal office, visiting, at stated intervals, the extensive districts of Ross and Argyle, often in a very frail and infirm state of health; for though his venerable aspect gave him the appearance of strength and vigour, his constitution seems to have been tender and delicate from his youth." He was buried in the churchyard of Dumbennan, in the same county, and a plain marble stone was placed over his grave, with an elegant Latin inscription, from the pen of the late worthy and venerable Mr. Skinner, of Longside¹.

THE MAD DEMOCRACY of the people of the United States exerted an influence upon the clergy of the southern states, which threatened to introduce disorder into the church of Connecticut. At a meeting of the clergy of that diocese, it was agreed to send a priest to Scotland to be consecrated as a coadjutor to Dr. Seabury, in order to preserve the church in that state from contamination from the wild principles of their neighbours. Bishop Seabury wrote therefore to bishop Skinner, dated 2d March, to inquire whether that step would meet the approbation of his respected brethren in Scotland. "In the meantime we shall be making the proper arrangements here, and the person fixed on may avail himself of the first opportunity of embarking after the receipt of your letter." There was at this time great danger that the withering heresy of Arianism would make some progress among the American clergy of the southern states; and the Scottish prelates were filled with anxiety lest there should be a total apostacy, not only from the ancient discipline, but from "the faith once delivered to the saints." They were relieved from this apprehension by the publication of a new edition of the American Convention's prayer-book, which was "much more unexceptionable than the first [edition of their prayer-book], there being no deterioration to the worse, and some even to the better." In reply to bishop Seabury's application, bishop Skinner expressed the readiness of his brethren to consecrate any one whom the church in Connecticut should send with proper credentials, at the same time remarking, that his friends in America must be

¹ Episcopal Magazine, iii. pp. 330-332.

aware "prudence bids us turn our eyes to our own situation, which, though it affords no excuse for shrinking from duty, will, at the same time, justify our not stepping beyond our line any farther than duty requires¹."

A SECOND CONSECRATION in Scotland was, however, rendered unnecessary by the consecration at Lambeth of Dr. White and Provoost this year. The first step taken by the other states towards gathering the disjointed members of the church was taken in May, 1784, by a few clergymen of the states of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, who met in New Brunswick, in reference to a society that had been formed for the relief of the widows and children of deceased clergymen. On this occasion it was resolved to convene a larger meeting, for the purpose of agreeing on some general principles of union. A meeting was accordingly held in New York on the 5th of the ensuing October, and they agreed to recognise episcopacy as a fundamental principle, and the Book of Common-Prayer. But, alas! they also recognised a principle like Nebuchadnezzar's image; for although the head was pure gold, yet his feet was part of iron and *part of clay*, which, it is much to be feared, will "become like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors," to be carried away by the wind, and "no place be found for them." I mean, that they agreed to adopt a representative body of the church, which is good, and may be called the iron and brass; but this body was to consist of clergy *and laity*, which undoubtedly was the *miry clay* of the feet and toes—an element inconsistent with the divine government of episcopacy, and containing the seeds of destruction within itself. The idea of mixing the iron and clay together arose from the representatives of the middle states, based upon the supposition that it would supply the parliamentary sanction, as in England, to the acts of the church. The northern clergy, with the bishop of Connecticut and his clergy, were decidedly opposed to this uncatholic and presbyterianising system. At a subsequent meeting in September, 1785, an ecclesiastical constitution was framed, which provided for a convention of the church in each state, and also a triennial general convention, consisting of a clerical and lay deputation from each particular state. There was also considerable tampering with the Prayer-Book. A document was drawn up by unanimous consent addressed to the English prelates, acknowledging the past favours received from them through the Propagation Society; declaring the desire of the

¹ Annals, 65-71.

convention to perpetuate in America the principles of the Church of England; and requesting the bishops to consecrate those persons to the episcopacy that should be sent to England for that purpose. The address was sent to the archbishop of Canterbury through Mr. Adams, the minister at the British court. Early in 1786, an answer was sent, signed by the two archbishops and eighteen bishops, signifying their good will to comply with the request of the American clergy; but requesting a little time to consider the alterations made by the convention. Soon afterwards the two archbishops wrote again, expressing their disapprobation of several of the proposed alterations; but stating also that they expected to obtain an act of parliament, under which, if satisfaction should be given, they would feel at liberty to consecrate for the American church. In consequence of the receipt of these communications, two special general conventions were held in 1786, when some amendments were made to the constitution that had been adopted the preceding year, and several objectionable alterations in the liturgy were removed, which we have seen called forth the approbation of bishop Skinner. Dr. Provoost was elected to the episcopate for New York, Dr. White for Pennsylvania, and Dr. Griffiths for Virginia. The two former embarked for England in November, and on the 14th of February, 1787, were consecrated by Dr. Moore, archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by Dr. Markham, archbishop of York, Dr. Moss, bishop of Bath and Wells, and Dr. Hinchinbiff, bishop of Peterborough. Dr. Griffiths was prevented from accompanying his brethren to England by domestic circumstances, and he afterwards resigned his pretensions to the episcopate¹. Archbishop Moore took the American prelates round in the most solemn manner not to lay hands on any man who calls in question the doctrine of the Trinity or of our Saviour's atonement; and strongly recommended them to hold communion with the bishop of Connecticut².

IN CONSEQUENCE of the death of bishop Petrie, bishop Macfarlane, his coadjutor, was collated to the bishopricks of Moray and Ross, now vacant. The clergy of the bishoprick of Brechin elected Dr. Abernethy Drummond, one of the clergy of Edinburgh, to be their bishop, and at the same time they elected Mr. John Strachan, priest at Dundee, to be his coadjutor in that bishoprick. These gentlemen were both consecrated at Peterhead on the 26th of September, being the anniversary of the martyrdom of St. Cyprian, bishop of Car-

¹ Caswall's *America*, *passim*.

² Skinner's *Annals*, 70.

thage, by bishop Kilgour, *primus*, assisted by bishops Skinner and Macfarlane ¹.

1788.—ON THE 31st of January, Charles Edward Stuart, the grandson and undoubted heir both of the claims and of the misfortunes of king James II. and VII., died at Rome. He assumed the title of the count of Albany; but he was generally styled by the Romans IL RE. “As Charles advanced in years, the misfortunes of his family, and particularly the sufferings of his faithful and affectionate adherents in Scotland, sunk down upon his heart, and at length drove him to that unhappy expedient which momentarily mitigates the pain of reflection only by rendering the mind unable to reflect. A cloud fell upon the latter days of Charles; and the most partial and affectionate of his friends have been compelled, with sorrow, to acknowledge, that death released him from a state of deep sottishness and occasional fatuity. But many have yielded to similar frailties who had not the burthen to bear which eventually crushed the fortitude of prince Charles; and, as a still further apology, it may be stated on the authority of universal and acknowledged tradition, that the painful inroads made upon his intellects were occasioned *more* by what he felt for *others* than for himself.” Mr. Greathead, continues the reviewer of Hogg’s *Jacobite Relics*, “a personal friend of Mr. Fox, and a staunch whig, succeeded when at Rome, in 1782 or 1783, in obtaining an interview with Charles Edward; and, being alone with him for some time, studiously led the conversation to his Enterprise in Scotland, and to the occurrences that succeeded the failure of that attempt. The prince manifested some reluctance to enter upon these topics, appearing at the same time to undergo so much mental suffering, that his guest regretted the freedom he had used in calling up the remembrance of his misfortunes. At length, however, the prince seemed to shake off the load which oppressed him: his eye brightened; his face assumed unwonted animation, and he entered upon the narrative of his Scottish campaigns with a distinct but somewhat vehement energy of manner—recounted his marches, his battles, his victories, his retreats, and his defeat;—detailed his hair-breadth escapes in the Western Isles, the invincible and devoted attachment of his highland friends, and at length proceeded to allude to the dreadful penalties with which the chiefs among them had been visited. But here the tide of emotion rose too high to allow

¹ Skinner, ii. 687.—Annals, Appendix, 537.—Prim. Truth and Order, 524.—Perceval’s Apology, 255.

him to go on—his voice faltered, his eye became fixed, and he fell convulsed on the floor. The noise brought into the room his daughter, the duchess of Albany, who happened to be in the adjoining apartment. ‘Sir,’ she exclaimed, ‘what is this? you have been speaking to my father about Scotland and the highlanders! No one dares to mention those subjects in his presence.’ But the character of Charles is to be estimated not by his feelings in the dotage of age and mental decrepitude, but by his conduct in the prime of youth; when possessed of power; when the prize of life was still before him, and when the die of fortune was still in his hand uncast; or when the tide of events set in against him, when his hopes were crushed, when the brilliant prospect of recovering the proudest crown in the world faded before his eyes; when he became a fugitive, was hunted like a wild beast from rock to rock and cave to cave, without food for days and nights together, and hearing nothing around him but the shouts of enemies or the dying roans of his friends, and seeing nothing but the smoke of their plundered habitations, or the movements of infuriated soldiers who thirsted for his blood¹.”

THE ACCOUNTS of the prince’s death reached Scotland about the middle of February. This event had been long looked forward to, in the hope that it would put a period to the sufferings of the reformed catholic church of Scotland, which had been so great and so long continued, not only as a witness for episcopacy, but for the great principle of christian morality and hereditary right. It was a critical moment for the church. The bishops communicated their respective opinions to each other with regard to the steps proper to be taken on this occasion. Bishop Abernethy Drummond had been translated from Brechin to the diocese of Edinburgh, where he resided, and bishop Strachan, his coadjutor in Brechin, had been appointed his successor in that see. The bishop of Edinburgh stated the present posture of the church to his clergy, and summoned a meeting to deliberate on what measures were proper to be adopted. They met on the 13th of March, and solved that it was proper to offer their allegiance to George III. and begged that their ecclesiastical superiors would favourably receive their opinion. On the 9th of April, the annual synod of the diocese of Aberdeen met at Longside, when bishop Skinner informed his clergy that it became now not only expedient but necessary to consider whether, and to what extent, compliance with the government might afford the means

¹ Scottish Episcopal Magazine, March, 1821, ii. 116, 117.

of relief to their bondage. The synod were unanimously of opinion that they were now at full liberty to pray by name for king George; but they recommended that it might be done under the authority of the episcopal college, that should issue an explanatory mandate, to be read by the clergy to their respective congregations. Similar resolutions were adopted at all the other diocesan synods with the greatest unanimity, one clergyman only standing out, the Rev. — Brown, of Montrose, in the diocese of Brechin. Bishop Rose, too, of Dunblane, was opposed to compliance, as he considered the claims of Charles Edward to have devolved on his brother, the cardinal of York, whom they designated Henry IX.¹

IN ORDER to give more solemnity to the act of recognition, and to give it all due authority, the primus summoned an episcopal synod to meet at Aberdeen on the 24th of April; the deans of the different dioceses attending, as representing the inferior clergy. At this synod it was agreed to give a public proof of their submission to the present government, by praying for king George and the royal family, in the express words of the English liturgy. This resolution was published in the Edinburgh and Aberdeen newspapers, and printed circulars were distributed among the laity, so that none might plead ignorance. The notice to the clergy ran, — “THEREFORE [the bishops] appoint their clergy to make public notification to their respective congregations, upon the 18th day of May next, that, upon the following Lord’s day, nominal prayers for the king are to be authoritatively introduced, and afterwards to continue, in the religious assemblies of this episcopal church. And they beg leave to recommend, as to their clergy whose obedience they expect, so likewise to all good christian people under their episcopal care, and do earnestly entreat and exhort them, in the bowels of Jesus Christ, that they will all cordially receive this determination of their spiritual fathers².” In consequence of this resolution, every clergyman, except Mr. Brown, did freely and *ex animo*, on Sunday the 25th of May, pray by name for king George, the queen, the prince of Wales, and all the royal family³. But, says a Mr. Campbell, an old jacobite, “well do I remember the day on which the name of GEORGE was mentioned in the Morning Service for the first time—such blowing of noses—such significant hums—such half-suppressed sighs—such smothered groans and universal confusion, can

¹ Skinner’s Annals, 77.—Life of Donald M’Intosh, Episcopal Magazine.

² Skinner’s Ecclesiast. Hist. ii. 689.

³ Annals, 78.

urdly be conceived! But the deed was done, and those who had participated could not retract¹." Many in Edinburgh will remember a well-known sturdy jacobite, Alexander Mackett, esq., who invariably rose from his knees and blew his nose, when the collects for the king and royal family were read, till George IV. visited Edinburgh. On that event, Mackett was infected with the enthusiasm of the people, pronounced his majesty "*a fine lad*;" and ever afterwards kept in kneeling posture, and joined in the prayers for the king.

ON THE 26th of April the bishops addressed a joint letter to lord Sydney, one of the principal secretaries of state, communicating to him the determination of their synod, and requesting his lordship to lay their submission at the foot of the throne. They also addressed letters to the archbishops of Canterbury and York, in which they express their confidence that, upon "their grace's recommending to the bishops of their respective provinces the measure of repeal of those penal statutes under which the episcopal church in Scotland has so long groaned, they cannot doubt but that by such powerful assistance they shall obtain the desirable end they have in view²." The bishop of Edinburgh received lord Sydney's reply to the bishop's letter; it is dated the 28th of June, in which he says, "I did not fail to lay those letters before the king, and I have received his royal commands to acquaint you that his majesty received, with great satisfaction, this proof of our attachment to his person and family." It does not appear that the two archbishops made any answer to the letters addressed to them.

AS THE PRIMUS was old and infirm, and as he, besides, resided in a remote country town, whilst the exigencies of the church now required a younger and a firmer hand to guide her affairs, bishop Kilgour resigned the office of primus in the month of December. This was a wise and judicious step; although he was a most excellent and pious prelate, and had governed the church with great prudence, yet, from age and infirmity, he was disabled for the active exertions, both of body and mind, which the altered position of the church required. During his primacy, that grain of mustard-seed to which the kingdom of heaven is likened, was sowed in the field of the transatlantic church; which, from being the least of all seeds, has since that time taken root downward and borne fruit upward, so that it has become a mighty tree. It

¹ Life of Rev. D. Mackintosh, Ep. Mag. 1836, vol. iv. p. 190.

² Annals, pp. 79-81.

has been exalted above the hills, and the people of that vast empire are flowing into it; so that the divine laws are taught, and the paths of the Lord are shewn, to the infidel and them that sit in the seat of the scorner. Bishop Kilgour leavened a little meal, which is going on steadily and silently to leaven the whole lump of the United States. The seed having been once sown, sprung up, and grew, nobody knew how; first the blade, then the ear, and now the full corn in the ear. From one solitary individual, rich in faith, that received the *charisma* from the hands of bishop Kilgour, in 1784, and a body of clergy not amounting to two hundred, the catholic church of the United States now numbers twenty-two bishops and upwards of a thousand inferior clergy. This branch of the vine is continually advancing; the leaven is still leavening more and more, and that nation is continuing to flow unto the mountain of the Lord's house. Along with the apostolic grace, bishop Seabury also carried the Scottish Eucharistic Office to America; and it has been adopted by the American church. "A cloud of unlooked-for witnesses has thus been raised up to bear onward to a new race of churchmen in the boundless plains of America, the confession of those sound doctrines of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which were kept, and for that very purpose doubtless, in the 'districts of the far north,' through years of trouble and persecution. The American liturgy has those very doctrines, 'phrases and forms of speech,' which distinguish the Scottish office. Let it not, therefore, be said that our blessed fathers laboured and witnessed *in vain*. Though their degenerate sons should sacrifice their work at the shrine of *expediency*, and abandon truth for the sake of peace, still the twenty-two bishops and the thousand clergy with their flocks in the western world, daily increasing in number and in moral power, will carry on to future ages the memorial of these lowly men; and thus we hope and trust that, through God's mercy, their witness will never die¹."

ONE GREAT SIN of the present race of churchmen is their fear of giving umbrage or offence to the dissenters. It is a great, a pestilential, and a growing *sin*, "which doth mock the meat it feeds on." It is our duty to do that which is lawful and right, and to leave the event to God. To shrink from our duty because it *may give offence* to men who seek every occasion of offence, and who the more they are humoured the more ready they are to take offence, *is a great sin*; so much, indeed, is their appetite increased by indulgence, that the very *being*

¹ Cheyne's Vindication, &c. 20, 21.

of the church has become an offence unto them. The English hierarchy made a difficulty in giving the apostolic succession to the United States, lest peradventure they might offend the dissenters. The Scottish church, on the contrary, nobly defied the offence, and, at the lowest point of her depression, her bishops freely carried out their divine Master's directions, to preach the gospel to every creature. Had the apostles been afraid of offending the heathen of their day, they would never have evangelised the world, nor have preached the gospel to all the world, according to the divine command. But this absurd and sinful fear of giving offence is, in fact, a going from the Lord in our hearts; it is a distrust of His providence, and of His promise of support and protection, and a trusting to the arm of flesh—to the sinful expediency of yielding principles to ignorant clamour and mockery.

AT THE REVOLUTION, the church might have continued to be the establishment of the kingdom, upon the condition of the bishops and clergy transferring their allegiance from their sovereign to the prince of Orange. William would have experienced no difficulty in supporting them; their people were the great majority of the nation, and the presbyterians were a mere handful, as has been demonstrated in this history. "But," says Mr. Cheyne, "the bishops, fully aware of all that they were giving up, unanimously resolved to keep truth and righteousness, and commit the church to God. From that moment she became a witness, not for episcopacy simply, but *for a great principle* of christian morality, viz. whether it was lawful in any case for subjects to resist the supreme power, and free themselves from the evils of misgovernment by means of their own devising, without regard to God's law. It is too little to say that the bishops were withheld by the oaths they had taken to king James. This was a personal obligation, binding on themselves only, and not extending to their successors, who might at any time have freed themselves from persecution by recognising the existing government. But such an act of recognition, as long as James II. or his representative survived, and asserted his claim to their allegiance, could not have been made without *approving* the principle involved in the Revolution of 1688, by which that monarch was dethroned. Hence they continued to witness for the great christian duty of obedience and fidelity, by suffering patiently the consequences of their devoted adherence to the line of exiled princes who claimed their allegiance, neither resisting the authority actually in possession, nor casting about for expedients to free themselves from the

**TO NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY**

**ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS**



THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
1000 5th Ave. New York 17, N.Y.

1000 5th Ave. New York 17, N.Y.

CHAPTER LXXV.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN SKINNER,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1789.—The bishop of Aberdeen chosen Primus.—A schism.—Illness of the king.—An address to the king.—First movements for the repeal of the penal statutes.—Intrigues of the Independents.—Bishops set out for London—their first movements.—Bill brought into the Commons—and carried to the Lords. Chancellor's opposition.—Return of the bishops.—A convention—a committee formed—and in London.—1790.—Postponed through fear of the Dissenters.—1791.—New parliament.—Fresh application.—Numbers of the Independents and the Episcopalians.—A controversy.—Probable numbers.—The burial service prohibited.—Death of bishop Rose.—1792.—Meeting of parliament—bill brought in.—Chancellor's opposition.—Bishop Horsley's denance—required to sign the Thirty-nine Articles.—A restriction.—Bill reported and printed—read a first time in the Commons—thrown out.—New bill moved for—read and passed.—The act.—Remarks.

1789.—UPON THE RESIGNATION of bishop Kilgour, the bishop of Aberdeen was chosen Primus of the Episcopal College. With the exception of a few individuals, the whole church over which this distinguished prelate was called to preside was unanimous in yielding their allegiance to George Third. The Rev. Mr. Brown, of Montrose, chose to stand out, and attempted to constitute himself the head of the non-conformist party. Bishop Rose, who was now in his dotage, had also been unwilling to transfer his allegiance, and to him alone applied, and was by him alone consecrated. Bishop Rose, however, was unconscious of his actions, and did this very uncanonical act in ignorance, and in the imbecility of extreme old age. When questioned by his brethren whether or not he had consecrated this man, he answered, that probably some other sister may have done it, but certainly he did not. Brown afterwards ordained a Mr. Donald Mackintosh, and these two

ministered to the non-conformists, traversing the inaccessible fastnesses of the Grampians through Glentilt to Glenshee, and thence as far as to the town of Banff, on the north-east coast; each looking upon himself as Elijah did of old, and saying—"I, even I only, remain a prophet of the Lord; but Baal's prophets are numerous." Among the determined jacobites who now stuck to their creed, although it was without an object, were Gilbert Innes, Esq. of Stowe, in Selkirkshire; lord Bannatyne, one of the judges, and his brother-in-law, sir John Macgregor Murray, of Lanrick. A few years, however, were sufficient to remove by death all the schismatics; "so that among the episcopalians of Scotland a seed of political disaffection exists no longer¹." In Brown's case there was not the plea of necessity to require any relaxation of the canon that requires three consecrators; and his consecration was repudiated by the whole church "as the device of an individual, to carry out his own projects, in opposition to her unanimous determination. And if we take into account the clandestine and surreptitious manner in which he procured imposition of hands from an aged and imbecile prelate, it will not be thought to have been without reason that his consecration was said to be 'null and void².'"

THE PUBLIC BUSINESS was in a great measure suspended by the king's sudden and dangerous illness. The episcopalians testified their loyalty by fervent public prayers, and a solemn thanksgiving on his majesty's recovery. The Scottish bishops also drew up a congratulatory address to the sovereign, which they all signed for themselves and their clergy. The new primus enclosed it in a letter to Mr. Henry Dundas, who forwarded it to lord Sydney for presentation. In his letter to Mr. Dundas, bishop Skinner writes, "We cannot but flatter ourselves that this is a most promising season for obtaining the object of our humble wishes, which is only to be put on an equal footing of protection and religious liberty with dissenters from the Scottish establishment, particularly with those [Independents] who have their orders from the church of England." Lord Sydney informed bishop Skinner that his majesty had received their address most graciously³.

AT MR. DUNDAS'S desire, bishop Skinner prepared the draught of a bill for the relief of the Scottish church, and forwarded it to him at Melville castle; but he was summoned to London before he could give his opinion on its nature and lan-

¹ Annals, 83.—Episcopal Magazine, iv. 191.

² Episcopal Mag. iv. 306.

³ Annals, 87, 88.

age. George Dempster, esq. of Dunnichen, and member for the county of Forfar, informed the primus, that unless a member of the administration would positively pledge himself to introduce the bill into parliament for the repeal of the penal statutes, and to carry it through all its stages, it would be absolutely necessary for some of the bishops to repair to London, to claim, as loyal subjects, assistance and reasonable relief from the statutes by which their church had been so long and so cruelly oppressed¹. The propriety of this advice was the more obvious from the malicious misrepresentations of the episcopal Independents, who had become alarmed at the favourable position of the church, and the countenance which it now obtained from men in power and influence. Some of these schismatical clergymen wrote to Dr. Bagot, bishop of Norwich, to prejudice him, and through him the English hierarchy, against the reviving church from which they had separated. They even went so far as to assert that the bishops, in seeking liberty for themselves, intended to procure the subjection of the Independents to their dominion. To counterwork this malicious assertion the primus shewed a copy of the above-mentioned draught of the proposed bill to Dr. Beattie of Aberdeen, the intimate friend of bishop Porteous, requesting that the doctor would undeceive his lordship on this point, and to assure him, "that though the Scottish bishops and their clergy heartily wished for union, founded on principle, amongst all the episcopalians in Scotland, yet had they not the most distant idea of endeavouring to promote it by the interposition of civil authority; nothing being more absurd or liberal than the very thought of depriving others of that liberty of conscience which they were so desirous of procuring for themselves²."

DR. BEATTIE expressed himself pleased with the principle of the bill, and liberally undertook to write to the bishop of London in favour of the measure. "Immediately after Easter, when the nation at large was exhibiting transports of joy on account of the king's happy recovery, the bishops Skinner of Aberdeen, Abernethy Drummond of Edinburgh, and Erskine of Brechin, set out for London, furnished with the most ample recommendations from all and sundry in the different districts in Scotland, who had friends or relatives members of the British legislature." Even the presbyterians themselves, forgetting their old animosities and the obligations of their Covenant, gave the most friendly introductions

¹ Annals, 89.

² Ibid. 90, 91.

to their friends in London. The Scottish prelates arrived in the capital on the 24th of April. They first applied to the lord advocate, who expressed his belief that the establishment of Scotland would not make any opposition to their relief. The Independents maliciously insinuated to the lord advocate, that there ought to be a clause inserted in the bill to provide that some English or Irish bishop should be authorised to perform episcopal offices in Scotland. This was evidently to legalize and perpetuate their own schism, and to render their return to the church impracticable. The three prelates, therefore, wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury on the first of May, giving his grace a fair and candid account of the affairs of the Scottish church. "Our case," they say, "your grace will readily perceive is very different from that both of the English dissenters and of the Scottish Roman catholics, with which some affect to compare it. They are both restrained on account of their religious creed, which continues the same; whereas the restraints laid upon the episcopal church in Scotland were judged necessary only for crushing the *political* disaffection ascribed to the clergy and lay members of that church, which political disaffection is now entirely done away. We have only further to add, that having, since we came to England, joined the public devotions of the English church, *we hereby declare ourselves to be in full communion with that church.* The Book of Common Prayer we believe in our hearts to be the best composed liturgy in the world. The morning and evening service, as read in that book, we constantly make use of, and the offices of matrimony, baptism, confirmation, &c. as occasion offers; and though we generally use the Scottish communion office yet so far are we from making this usage a condition of communion, that our own clergy have a discretionary power to use which of the two offices they please, and some of them do actually make use of the English office¹." The archbishop promised them his support, but in the meantime the English bishops were embarrassed by the factious claims of the dissenters; and until their affairs were disposed of, the case of the Scottish church could not be undertaken. The lord advocate recommended the Scottish prelates to draw up an historical detail of the penal statutes, and of the relief required, for the information of Mr. Pitt and the lord chancellor Thurlow. This was done, and printed for circulation amongst the members of both Houses of Parliament. On Monday, the 15th of June, Mr.

¹ Annals, 95-97.

Dundas, the treasurer of the navy, moved, in the House of Commons, for leave to bring in a bill; which motion was seconded by Mr. Dempster, member for Forfar, who informed us, says bishop Skinner in his Narrative, "that not only did every person in the House listen to the motion with apparent satisfaction, but when sir Harry Houghton was voted into the chair, he was heard to say, he never took it with greater pleasure than on this same occasion." On the second reading, sir Archibald Macdonald the attorney-, and SIR JOHN SCOTT the solicitor-general, complained that they had not been consulted before the introduction of the bill; but they were very easily reconciled, and made no opposition. On Friday, the 29th of June, the bill was read a third time, passed without a dissentient voice, and ordered to be sent to the House of Lords, where it was presented at the bar by Mr. Dundas, and, on the motion of the earl of Hopetoun, was read the first time¹.

THE BILL WAS arrested in its farther progress by the lord chancellor, who was piqued that the Scottish prelates had made no personal application to him. On discovering the cause of his opposition, the bishops hastened to apologise to his lordship, and to state that their neglect was altogether unintentional. But the chancellor's self-love had been much hurt, and he would not for the present accept their explanation, but, with a meanness of spirit unbecoming so great a man, persevered in his opposition; and the farther consideration of the bill was postponed till the 29th of September. The primus and his colleagues, therefore, returned to Scotland about the middle of July, and had the satisfaction of finding their conduct approved in all the synodical meetings of the church².

THE PRIMUS having obtained the consent of his colleagues, summoned a convention or synod of the church, to be composed of all the clergy, with a lay delegate from each congregation, to be holden on Wednesday, the 11th of November, at Laurencekirk, for the purpose of taking into consideration the present state of the application to government for the repeal of the penal laws. The convention was opened by an address from the chair, stating the objects of the meeting, and giving a minute narration of the whole of the proceedings of the bishops during their absence in London. Their conduct was highly approved, and an address of thanks

¹ Annals, 98-112.—Narrative of the Proceedings relating to the Bill which was lately passed into a Law, intituled "An Act for granting Relief to Pastors, Ministers, and Lay Persons of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland, 1792." page 6.

² Narrative, p. 6.—Annals, 122.

of relief to their bondage. The synod were unanimously of opinion that they were now at full liberty to pray by name for king George; but they recommended that it might be done under the authority of the episcopal college, that should issue an explanatory mandate, to be read by the clergy to their respective congregations. Similar resolutions were adopted at all the other diocesan synods with the greatest unanimity, one clergyman only standing out, the Rev. — Brown, of Montrose, in the diocese of Brechin. Bishop Rose, too, of Dunblane, was opposed to compliance, as he considered the claims of Charles Edward to have devolved on his brother, the cardinal of York, whom they designated Henry IX.¹

IN ORDER to give more solemnity to the act of recognition, and to give it all due authority, the primus summoned an episcopal synod to meet at Aberdeen on the 24th of April; the deans of the different dioceses attending, as representing the inferior clergy. At this synod it was agreed to give a public proof of their submission to the present government, by praying for king George and the royal family, in the express words of the English liturgy. This resolution was published in the Edinburgh and Aberdeen newspapers, and printed circulars were distributed among the laity, so that none might plead ignorance. The notice to the clergy ran, — “THEREFORE [the bishops] appoint their clergy to make public notification to their respective congregations, upon the 18th day of May next, that, upon the following Lord’s day, nominal prayers for the king are to be authoritatively introduced, and afterwards to continue, in the religious assemblies of this episcopal church. And they beg leave to recommend, as to their clergy whose obedience they expect, so likewise to all good christian people under their episcopal care, and do earnestly entreat and exhort them, in the bowels of Jesus Christ, that they will all cordially receive this determination of their spiritual fathers².” In consequence of this resolution, every clergyman, except Mr. Brown, did freely and *ex animo*, on Sunday the 25th of May, pray by name for king George, the queen, the prince of Wales, and all the royal family³. But, says a Mr. Campbell, an old jacobite, “well do I remember the day on which the name of GEORGE was mentioned in the Morning Service for the first time—such blowing of noses—such significant hums—such half-suppressed sighs—such smothered groans and universal confusion, can

¹ Skinner’s Annals, 77.—Life of Donald M’Intosh, Episcopal Magazine.

² Skinner’s Ecclesiast. Hist. ii. 689.

³ Annals, 78.

ardly be conceived! But the deed was done, and those who had participated could not retract¹." Many in Edinburgh will remember a well-known sturdy jacobite, Alexander Lackett, esq., who invariably rose from his knees and blew his nose, when the collects for the king and royal family were read, till George IV. visited Edinburgh. On that event, Lackett was infected with the enthusiasm of the people, pronounced his majesty "*a fine lad*;" and ever afterwards kept in kneeling posture, and joined in the prayers for the king.

ON THE 26th of April the bishops addressed a joint letter to Lord Sydney, one of the principal secretaries of state, communicating to him the determination of their synod, and requesting his lordship to lay their submission at the foot of the throne. They also addressed letters to the archbishops of Canterbury and York, in which they express their confidence that, upon "their grace's recommending to the bishops of their respective provinces the measure of repeal of those penal statutes under which the episcopal church in Scotland has so long groaned, they cannot doubt but that by such powerful assistance they shall obtain the desirable end they have in view²." The bishop of Edinburgh received Lord Sydney's reply to the bishop's letter; it is dated the 28th of June, in which he says, "I did not fail to lay those letters before the king, and I have received his royal commands to acquaint you that his majesty received, with great satisfaction, this proof of our attachment to his person and family." It does not appear that the two archbishops made any answer to the letters addressed to them.

AS THE PRIMUS was old and infirm, and as he, besides, resided in a remote country town, whilst the exigencies of the church now required a younger and a firmer hand to guide her affairs, bishop Kilgour resigned the office of primus in the month of December. This was a wise and judicious step; although he was a most excellent and pious prelate, and had governed the church with great prudence, yet, from age and infirmity, he was disabled for the active exertions, both of body and mind, which the altered position of the church required. During his primacy, that grain of mustard-seed to which the kingdom of heaven is likened, was sowed in the field of the transatlantic church; which, from being the least of all seeds, has since that time taken root downward and borne fruit upward, so that it has become a mighty tree. It

¹ Life of Rev. D. Mackintosh, Ep. Mag. 1836, vol. iv. p. 190.

² Annals, pp. 79-81.

has been exalted above the hills, and the people of that empire are flowing into it; so that the divine laws are taught, and the paths of the Lord are shewn, to the infidel and those that sit in the seat of the scorner. Bishop Kilgour leavened a little meal, which is going on steadily and silently to leaven the whole lump of the United States. The seed having been once sown, sprung up, and grew, nobody knew how; first the blade, then the ear, and now the full corn in the ear. From one solitary individual, rich in faith, that received the *charism* from the hands of bishop Kilgour, in 1784, and a body of clergy not amounting to two hundred, the catholic church of the United States now numbers twenty-two bishops and upwards of a thousand inferior clergy. This branch of the vine is continually advancing; the leaven is still leavening more and more, and that nation is continuing to flow unto the mountain of the Lord's house. Along with the apostolic grace, bishop Seabury also carried the Scottish Eucharistic Office to America; and it has been adopted by the American church. "A cloud of unlooked-for witnesses has thus been raised up to bear onward to a new race of churchmen in the boundless plains of America, the confession of those sound doctrines of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which were kept, and for that very purpose doubtless, in the 'districts of the far north,' through years of trouble and persecution. The American liturgy has those very doctrines, 'phrases and forms of speech,' which distinguish the Scottish office. Let it not, therefore, be said that our blessed fathers laboured and witnessed *in vain*. Though their degenerate sons should sacrifice their work at the shrine of *expediency*, and abandon truth for the sake of peace, still the twenty-two bishops and the thousand clergy with their flocks in the western world, daily increasing in number and in moral power, will carry on to future ages the memorial of these lowly men; and thus we hope and trust that, through God's mercy, their witness will never die¹."

ONE GREAT SIN of the present race of churchmen is their fear of giving umbrage or offence to the dissenters. It is a great, a pestilential, and a growing *sin*, "which doth mock the meat it feeds on." It is our duty to do that which is lawful and right, and to leave the event to God. To shrink from our duty because it *may give offence* to men who seek every occasion of offence, and who the more they are humoured the more ready they are to take offence, *is a great sin*; so much, indeed, is their appetite increased by indulgence, that the very *being*


¹ Cheyne's Vindication, &c. 20, 21.


the church has become an offence unto them. The English hierarchy made a difficulty in giving the apostolic succession to the United States, lest peradventure they might offend the dissenters. The Scottish church, on the contrary, nobly justified the offence, and, at the lowest point of her depression, her bishops freely carried out their divine Master's directions, to preach the gospel to every creature. Had the apostles been afraid of offending the heathen of their day, they would never have evangelised the world, nor have preached the gospel to all the world, according to the divine command. But this absurd and sinful fear of giving offence is, in fact, a going down from the Lord in our hearts; it is a distrust of His providence, and of His promise of support and protection, and a trusting to the arm of flesh—to the sinful expediency of yielding principles to ignorant clamour and mockery.

AT THE REVOLUTION, the church might have continued to be the establishment of the kingdom, upon the condition of the bishops and clergy transferring their allegiance from their sovereign to the prince of Orange. William would have experienced no difficulty in supporting them; their people were the great majority of the nation, and the presbyterians were a mere handful, as has been demonstrated in this history. "But," says Mr. Cheyne, "the bishops, fully aware of all that they were giving up, unanimously resolved to keep truth and righteousness, and commit the church to God. From that moment she became a witness, not for episcopacy simply, but *for a great principle* of christian morality, viz. whether it was lawful in any case for subjects to resist the supreme power, and free themselves from the evils of misgovernment by means of their own devising, without regard to God's law. It is too little to say that the bishops were withheld by the oaths they had taken to king James. This was a personal obligation, binding on themselves only, and not extending to their successors, who might at any time have freed themselves from persecution by recognising the existing government. But such an act of recognition, as long as James I. or his representative survived, and asserted his claim to their allegiance, could not have been made without *approving* the principle involved in the Revolution of 1688, by which that monarch was dethroned. Hence they continued to witness for the great christian duty of obedience and fidelity, by suffering patiently the consequences of their devoted adherence to the line of exiled princes who claimed their allegiance, neither resisting the authority actually in possession, nor casting about for expedients to free themselves from the

embarrassments in which they were involved by the continued pretensions of the Stuarts. Providence at length put an end to their difficulties by the death of Charles Edward, the grandson of James II., with whom expired the pretensions of his family. A recognition of the existing government, on the part of the church of Scotland, involved no approbation of the revolution principle. It was in possession; no other power came in competition with it; no one demanded their allegiance but the occupant of the throne, and the bishops and clergy hastened to tender it, pledging their fidelity to him as their king to whom they had before submitted as having power. They were called ‘disaffected to the government;’ but their disaffection was a very different thing from what is indicated by that term now. They never had made the principles or the policy of government the rule of their obedience; they looked simply to the *rightful* power; and when they transferred their allegiance to the Brunswick line, the only question they considered was the *morality* of the act. Their conduct was wholly uninfluenced by politics, if by politics be meant any principle or rule of action independent of religion and the sense of future responsibility.” At the diocesan synod, when it was resolved to tender the church’s allegiance to king George, Mr. Jolly said, in concluding his address—“I trust that God will not suffer us to run into dangerous error, if we sincerely seek His direction. If we lift up our souls unto Him, He will shew us the way we should walk in. If the glory of His name, in the healing of schism, and the preservation and enlargement of his church, be our aim, and not the acquisition of ease and temporal emolument to ourselves, our designs and intentions are surely right in His sight, and with this single eye we may expect to see our way clearly. Our compliance with the present government will not, I hope, imply our adopting those principles which brought about the Revolution, nor subject us to the guilt of rebellion and resistance; nor yet, in the light I view it, be inconsistent with the principles on which our practice hitherto has been founded, and which are, I believe, the principles of Scripture, as illustrated by the practice of the primitive church¹.”

¹ Life of Bishop Jolly, prefixed to his ‘Friendly Address,’ vi. vii. viii.





CHAPTER LXXV.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN SKINNER,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1789.—The bishop of Aberdeen chosen Primus.—A schism.—Illness of the king.—An address to the king.—First movements for the repeal of the penal statutes.—Intrigues of the Independents.—Bishops set out for London—their first movements.—Bill brought into the Commons—and carried to the Lords. Chancellor's opposition.—Return of the bishops.—A convention—a committee formed—and in London.—1790.—Postponed through fear of the Dissenters.—1791.—New parliament.—Fresh application.—Numbers of the Independents and the Episcopalians.—A controversy.—Probable numbers.—The burial service prohibited.—Death of bishop Rose.—1792.—Meeting of parliament—bill brought in.—Chancellor's opposition.—Bishop Horsley's denunciation—required to sign the Thirty-nine Articles.—A restriction.—Bill reported and printed—read a first time in the Commons—thrown out.—New bill moved and read and passed.—The act.—Remarks.

1789.—UPON THE RESIGNATION of bishop Kilgour, the bishop of Aberdeen was chosen Primus of the Episcopal College. With the exception of a few individuals, the whole church over which this distinguished prelate was called to side was unanimous in yielding their allegiance to George Third. The Rev. Mr. Brown, of Montrose, chose to stand out, and attempted to constitute himself the head of the non-conformist party. Bishop Rose, who was now in his dotage, also been unwilling to transfer his allegiance, and to him alone applied, and was by him alone consecrated. Bishop Rose, however, was unconscious of his actions, and did this uncanonical act in ignorance, and in the imbecility of extreme old age. When questioned by his brethren whether or he had consecrated this man, he answered, that probably his sister may have done it, but certainly he did not. Brown afterwards ordained a Mr. Donald Mackintosh, and these two

to their friends in London. The Scottish prelates arrived in the capital on the 24th of April. They first applied to the lord advocate, who expressed his belief that the establishment of Scotland would not make any opposition to their relief. The Independents maliciously insinuated to the lord advocate, that there ought to be a clause inserted in the bill to provide that some English or Irish bishop should be authorised to perform episcopal offices in Scotland. This was evidently to legalize and perpetuate their own schism, and to render their return to the church impracticable. The three prelates, therefore, wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury on the first of May, giving his grace a fair and candid account of the affairs of the Scottish church. "Our case," they say, "your grace will readily perceive is very different from that both of the English dissenters and of the Scottish Roman catholics, with which some affect to compare it. They are both restrained on account of their religious creed, which continues the same; whereas the restraints laid upon the episcopal church in Scotland were judged necessary only for crushing the *political* disaffection ascribed to the clergy and lay members of that church, which political disaffection is now entirely done away. We have only further to add, that having, since we came to England, joined the public devotions of the English church, *we hereby declare ourselves to be in full communion with that church.* The Book of Common Prayer we believe in our hearts to be the best composed liturgy in the world. The morning and evening service, as read in that book, we constantly make use of, and the offices of matrimony, baptism, confirmation, &c. as occasion offers; and though we generally use the Scottish communion office yet so far are we from making this usage a condition of communion, that our own clergy have a discretionary power to use which of the two offices they please, and some of them do actually make use of the English office¹." The archbishop promised them his support, but in the meantime the English bishops were embarrassed by the factious claims of the dissenters; and until their affairs were disposed of, the case of the Scottish church could not be undertaken. The lord advocate recommended the Scottish prelates to draw up an historical detail of the penal statutes, and of the relief required, for the information of Mr. Pitt and the lord chancellor Thurlow. This was done, and printed for circulation amongst the members of both Houses of Parliament. On Monday, the 15th of June, Mr.

¹ Annals, 95.97.

Dundas, the treasurer of the navy, moved, in the House of Commons, for leave to bring in a bill; which motion was seconded by Mr. Dempster, member for Forfar, who informed us, says bishop Skinner in his Narrative, "that not only did every person in the House listen to the motion with apparent satisfaction, but when sir Harry Houghton was voted into the chair, he was heard to say, he never took it with greater pleasure than on this same occasion." On the second reading, sir Archibald Macdonald the attorney-, and SIR JOHN SCOTT the solicitor-general, complained that they had not been consulted before the introduction of the bill; but they were very easily reconciled, and made no opposition. On Friday, the 29th of June, the bill was read a third time, passed without a dissentient voice, and ordered to be sent to the House of Lords, where it was presented at the bar by Mr. Dundas, and, on the motion of the earl of Hopetoun, was read the first time¹.

THE BILL WAS arrested in its farther progress by the lord chancellor, who was piqued that the Scottish prelates had made no personal application to him. On discovering the cause of his opposition, the bishops hastened to apologise to his lordship, and to state that their neglect was altogether unintentional. But the chancellor's self-love had been much hurt, and he would not for the present accept their explanation, but, with a meanness of spirit unbecoming so great a man, persevered in his opposition; and the farther consideration of the bill was postponed till the 29th of September. The primus and his colleagues, therefore, returned to Scotland about the middle of July, and had the satisfaction of finding their conduct approved in all the synodical meetings of the church².

THE PRIMUS having obtained the consent of his colleagues, summoned a convention or synod of the church, to be composed of all the clergy, with a lay delegate from each congregation, to be holden on Wednesday, the 11th of November, at Laurencekirk, for the purpose of taking into consideration the present state of the application to government for the repeal of the penal laws. The convention was opened by an address from the chair, stating the objects of the meeting, and giving a minute narration of the whole of the proceedings of the bishops during their absence in London. Their conduct was highly approved, and an address of thanks

¹ Annals, 98-112.—Narrative of the Proceedings relating to the Bill which was lately passed into a Law, intituled "An Act for granting Relief to Pastors, Ministers, and Lay Persons of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland, 1792." page 6.

² Narrative, p. 6.—Annals, 122.

was voted, which was conveyed by letter to the primus by bishop Macfarlane. A committee was formed, with full powers to manage and carry on the measures still held necessary to be done for obtaining a repeal of the penal statutes, to consist of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen. These were the primus, the bishop of Edinburgh, and the bishop of Brechin; the reverends John Allan, Edinburgh, GEORGE GLEIG, Stirling, Roger Aitken, Aberdeen; John Patullo, esq. of Balhoussie, commissary of St. Andrews, John Stirling, esq. of Kippendavie, and John Nevin, esq. of Thornton and Peebles. Having found that by bankruptcies and deaths the charitable funds of the church had much decreased, and that no distribution had been made, during the last twelve months, to indigent clergymen and widows, the convention made choice of trustees to manage these funds¹. “Nor can the annalist,” says Mr. Skinner, “forbear from here recording an instance of pure and disinterested friendship to the cause of Scottish episcopacy, and of zeal for its prosperity, such as may be equalled but never was and never will be surpassed. Those of the invaluable personal friends whom bishop Skinner had been fortunate enough to acquire during his stay in London, now informed him, that such was the interest which they felt in the repeal of the penal statutes, and such their anxiety to see the sound and orthodox episcopacy of Scotland alike respected as it was respectable, ‘they had formed themselves into a committee of correspondence with the committee appointed in Scotland by the Laurencekirk convention, and had determined to meet once a week, or as often as occasion might require, for the communication of intelligence, and to deliberate on the most proper steps to be taken for the speedy relief of a church they so much venerated.’” These were the hon. sir James Allan Park, one of the judges of the Common Pleas; the rev. Dr. George Gaskin, secretary to the Christian Knowledge Society; and William Stevens, esq. treasurer to queen Anne’s bounty².

1790.—THE FIRST ACT of the committee in Scotland was to transmit letters to the lord chancellor, the attorney- and solicitor-general, to be delivered by the London committee. The bishop of Bangor, who had much interest with the chancellor, undertook to remove his lordship’s prejudices; but even here the sinful fear of the dissenters operated unfavourably to the relief of the church. Lord Gardenston, a judge, wrote to lord Thurlow in favour of the measure, and said,—

¹ *Annals*, 125-141.

² *Ibid.* 141, 142.

“ Though bred a presbyterian, I have ever revered the order and decency of the episcopal church. In doctrine, they are soundly protestant. Their principles, in regard to government, are now reformed, and not less loyal than ours¹.” The attorney-general regretted that the church relief bill had not been made a cabinet measure, and bishop Horsley informed Dr. Gaskin that it must be postponed to the dissenters’ bill for a repeal of the Test Act, as “ it is not to be expected that the church of England will go to the field to assist an ally, when she herself is attacked in her own fortress.” The primus summoned a meeting of the Scottish committee to assemble at Perth on the 24th of February ; at which he delivered an account of the extensive correspondence which he had held with the London committee, to whom the thanks of the meeting were voted. Dr. Gaskin stated, in a letter to bishop Skinner, that there was every prospect of the bill being successful, “ excepting an allowance of your actual ministrations in the church of England².”

1791.—A NEW PARLIAMENT met in November last year, and after some uninteresting business, was adjourned till February. During the recess letters were written to all the English prelates, requesting their interest and support to the application, which it was intended to renew, for the repeal of the penal statutes. Among the answers to these letters, bishop Douglass of Carlisle said he had forwarded letters from Principals Robertson and Campbell to the archbishop, “ recommending, in the most liberal terms, the cause of the Scottish episcopalians, whose relief, they had reason to think, would be generally agreeable to the [presbyterian] church of Scotland.”

A VERY ACRIMONIOUS controversy appeared in the Gentleman’s Magazine, respecting the number of the *English*, or schismatical, and the Catholic episcopalians in Scotland at this period, from which we gather some facts relative to their numbers. Mr. Berkeley, it seems, had magnified the former to 100,000, whilst another reduced them to 30,000, and another still says the one-half might be deducted from the last amount, and a fourth alleges “ that the English communion in Scotland do not amount to more than 6,000, and they are well known in Scotland to be more numerous than the old non-juring party³.” This last assertion was answered by one signing E. S. P., who says,—“ I will not pretend to say what is the number of *Scotch* episcopalians, because I know there never was any attempt made to ascertain it; but this I *will*

¹ Annals, 147.² Ibid.³ Gentleman’s Magazine, lx. 197.

say, that they are well known in Scotland to *exceed* very far those of the English communion. This is a fact so well known that I am astonished any man would assert the contrary. . . . The English [Independent] chapels in Scotland may, I believe, be reckoned thus:—Edinburgh, 3; Aberdeen, 2; Kelso, Dalkeith, Musselburgh, Leith, Dumfries, Glasgow, Stirling, Perth, Dunkeld, Dundee, Arbroath, Montrose, Brechin, Stonehaven, Cruden, Peterhead, Old Deer, Banff, and Elgin, one meeting-house in each—total 24.” He speaks of another one, but does not name the place; but which, he says, was just about to be united to the Catholic bishop. He continues,—“ In making a statement of the *Scotch* communion, it would be vain even to guess what the number is in the highlands, where they are *very numerous*, and where the English communion never got a footing, unless we except a congregation in Inverness, which has long since come under the wings of the bishop of Ross. Nor would it be necessary to give a list of all the congregations in the low country, though, from my own knowledge, I could name *at least fifty*; but I suppose it will be sufficient to say, that there are *twenty congregations* in the diocese of Aberdeen alone. The Scotch communion have not decreased much for many years; and now I believe there is no danger of their doing so. But from the respect entertained for their principles by those that know them, it is greatly more probable that they will increase when leave is granted. As I have mentioned Aberdeen, I cannot forbear to take notice of its excellent diocesan, bishop Skinner (who is also *Primus Scotiæ episcopus*), a prelate much respected by all ranks and parties where he lives, known and regarded by many eminent characters on both sides of the Tweed, and much beloved by his clergy and people for his unremitting attention to the duties of his office.—E. S. P.¹”

THE ABOVE LETTER was replied to at great length by one of the Independent clergymen, signing CLERICUS, in the most vituperative and insulting language, a specimen of which I shall here extract, from which a judgment may be formed of the whole. The zeal of the bishops and clergy “ in the *good old cause*, as it is termed, was never doubted; for in this particular, as well as in many others, they are much upon an equality with another set of *impostors*; viz. the jesuits, now happily extinct. This zeal has prompted their bishops to send out more *preachers*; for small as their stipends are in this country, still *preaching* is a better trade than *cobbling*; but

¹ Gentleman's Magazine, lxi. 426, 427

the opposite party, I am persuaded, have more *hearers*." The italics are Clericus's own. Without either contradicting his opponent's statement of the number of Independent meeting-houses, which I am satisfied, from my own traditional knowledge, is correct, or stating any other number, he says,—“The truth is, there are *some* congregations in Scotland of the English communion, which contain 1000 or 1200 people, and these of the very first respectability and rank in the country, for *few* of any other description belong to their communion; and I am not afraid of being contradicted by any body, except, perhaps, by your correspondent and his party, when I affirm, as I now do, that the major part of the congregations of the *Scotch* communion do not contain, each, even *one-tenth part* of that number; and these congregations too, are, for the most part, composed of the lowest classes of the people¹.” This malicious account, however, upon Clericus's own shewing, would give about 6,000 to the depressed and persecuted reformed Catholic church at its lowest ebb, and after all the upper classes had coldly turned their backs upon their desolate mother. A tenth of his largest number would give an average of 120 to each of fifty congregations, which would amount to 6,000. Then give the twenty-four Independent meeting-houses an average of 500, their numbers would amount to 12,000, making together 18,000. We have, therefore, the probable amount of the Catholic and schismatical episcopalians in Scotland in the year 1791, as he states it; yet I think they greatly exceeded that number, as shall be afterwards shewn.

BY ANOTHER CORRESPONDENCE in the same miscellany, between Messrs. Bisset and Bruce, the collegiate presbyterian ministers of Brechin, and the Rev. T. Brown, one of the English ordained clergymen in that city, it appears that the reading of the burial-service in the church-yard had been prohibited. This they called an invasion of the legal privileges of the ministers of Brechin; and they add, the service itself “is fraught with a high degree of absurdity and superstition.” “The like was never done in the church-yard of Brechin; and we give you this warning, that while we entertain a charitable opinion of the many denominations of christians who differ from us, we are *determined* at the same time to maintain our legal privileges; and if the like be done again, it will be *cum periculo*.” From the answer to the above letter, dated Feb. 5, it appears that “while in Montrose [distant eight miles] the presbyterians are voluntarily accommodated with the use of

¹ Gentleman's Magazine, lxi. 901.

the episcopal [Independent] chapel there for divine service . . . probably for months and years together, while their own church is taking down and re-building, their next neighbours, the presbyterians of Brechin, have attempted to prohibit the episcopal congregation there from the performance of a most solemn part of divine service in the public burying-ground, in which I presume they have an equal privilege with themselves¹."

THE RIGHT REV. CHARLES ROSE, bishop of Dunkeld and Dunblane, died at Down, in the month of April. He had been for some time in a state of dotage, and unable to attend to the affairs of his diocese. This year stands remarkable, in the annals of meteorology, for a fall of *snow*, that took place on the festival of Whitsunday, which happened to be June 12, and a *thunderstorm* on Christmas eve².

1792.—IT WAS SUGGESTED by the London committee that one of the Scottish committee should be in London to attend the progress of the bill through both houses. The Scottish committee, therefore, empowered the primus, by a written instrument duly signed, to act in their names, to take such measures as he might find expedient, and to act as the representative of the whole church. He arrived in London in the end of March; and on the 2d of April, the earl of Kelly presented numerous petitions from the counties and burghs of Scotland in favour of the church; and he moved for leave to bring in a bill agreeably to the prayer of these petitions. Two days after, the bill was read a third time without any opposition from the chancellor, and it was ordered to be printed and laid on the table after the Easter holidays. The chancellor, however, was decidedly opposed to the bill, and used arguments which must have been prompted to him by enemies in Scotland. On the 2d of May, the earl of Elgin moved the second reading of the bill, and in a short but very sensible speech stated the principle of it to the house, and the merits of those whom it was intended to relieve. The chancellor insisted on introducing a clause into the bill requiring the clergy to register their letters of orders, else, he said, all sorts of people, even the blacksmith of Gretna-Green, might assume the character of *episcopal ministers*, and might in that character, if once tolerated, celebrate marriages, and do other irregular acts. To this the bishop of St. David's replied, that the Scotch episcopal clergy would very gladly register their orders, if the law would permit them; but the same act which required it, like-

¹ Gentleman's Magazine, lxi. 524, 525.

² Ibid. 333.

declared their orders to be *null and void*. The chancellor desirous of perpetuating that schism which had been created by the penal statutes, by a clause requiring candidates for orders to be ordained in England or Ireland. To this Lord Horsley replied, "with respect to the interests of episcopacy in Scotland, my opinion is, unfortunately, the very reverse of that of the noble and learned lord. The credit of episcopacy will never be advanced by the scheme of supplying episcopalian congregations in Scotland with pastors of ordination; for this reason, my lords, that it would be an *effect, crippled* episcopacy, that would be thus upheld in Scotland. When a clergyman, ordained by one of us, settles as pastor of a congregation in Scotland, *he is out of the reach of our authority. We have no authority there*; we can have no authority there; the legislature can give us no authority there. An attempt to introduce any thing of an authorised political episcopacy into Scotland would be a direct infringement of the constitution. My lords, as to the notion that clergymen should be specially ordained by us to the ministry in Scotland, I agree with the noble viscount [Stormont], that the thing would be contrary to all rule and order. No bishop, who knows what he does, ordains without a title, and a title must be a nomination to something certain in the diocese of the bishop that ordains. My lords, an appointment to an episcopal congregation in Scotland is no more a title to me, or to any bishop on the English bench, or any bishop of the Irish bench, than an appointment to a church in Mesopotamia.

MY LORDS, with respect to marriages . . . the episcopalians are authorised to marry in their meeting-houses, by the 10th year of Queen Anne. But I see no inconvenience that will arise from this. It will open no door to clandestine marriages; . . . they can marry those only whose banns have been regularly published, not only in the meeting-houses where the marriage is to be solemnised, but in the kirks of the parishes where the parties are resident. . . . Our marriage act extends not to Scotland. Therefore, by the law and usage of Scotland, it is necessary that any should be present at a wedding except the parties themselves (that's two), the man who is to act as best man and give the bride away (that's three), and the clergyman or pretended clergyman who is to perform the ceremony (that's four). [The exact number that the statute permitted to be present together]. Now, my lords, by the express permission of the 19th of the late king, which I call the persecuting statute, *four* persons may assemble for the celebration of any

religious rites, for the meeting is not illegal unless *five* be present, over and above the members of the family, if the place of assembly be a house inhabited by a family, or five if the place of assembly be a house not inhabited by a family. . . . I am aware that the bill must receive amendments in the committee, and perhaps additions, but *the principle* of the bill has *my entire approbation*¹."

THE EARL OF KINNOUL made a short speech in favour of the bill, and delivered his sentiments with much emphasis and energy. After he sat down, the question was put and carried without a division, that the bill should be read a second time, and go into a committee of the whole house, on the following Wednesday. In the meantime, bishop Horsley, and the earls of Kellie, Elgin, and Fife, intimated to bishop Skinner that the only thing which the lord chancellor insisted on was, the necessity of requiring from the Scottish clergy some declaration of their religious principles, by which it might be known that they came as near as was said to those of the church of England. It was therefore suggested that subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles ought to be required, as the best means of shewing in a legal manner that the reformed catholic church of Scotland was really such a society as "deserved to be tolerated." To this, bishop Skinner replied in effect, that almost none of the clergy had any objection to the general doctrine of the Articles; but that some of them might object to sign them as the "Articles of the Church of *England*, since the Scotch episcopal church was no part of the church of England, and could not, either in strictness of principle or propriety of language, be *included* in it." To this it was replied, that "it was only the general doctrine of the several articles, to which subscription was required even in England," and "that there could be no hardship or impropriety in our clergy subscribing them as 'Articles of the Church of England,' after they had professed that their principles were the same as hers in all the fundamental doctrines of religion, and that they wished to be considered as in communion with her; for subscription was doing that only in a more solemn and legal manner."

A CLAUSE was considered necessary to restrict the Scottish clergy from taking any benefice, curacy, or other spiritual promotion in England. This was said to be to preserve to the clergy of the church of England the civil rights and revenues

¹ Annals, 203-213.—Narrative, 17-23.

of their own church, and was not intended to cast any doubt upon the validity of Scottish orders. No part of the clause was intended to operate to the prejudice of the Scottish episcopacy in regard to its purely scriptural effects, and the Scottish clergy subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles would be considered as a public testimony of the mutual communion which subsisted between the two churches. On the 16th of May, the bill was reported, and ordered to be printed with the amendments that had been made in the committee. It was then read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Commons; where it was received and read a first time on the 25th May, and ordered to be printed. But just previous to the second reading, the speaker informed the house that the bill contained money clauses, which made its reception from the Lords inconsistent with the privileges of the Commons. He therefore moved that it be thrown out; but said another bill might be moved for immediately. This was done accordingly by Mr. Dundas, without any opposition; Mr. Fox only complaining that more partiality had been shewn to this bill than to one that he had lately introduced in favour of the Unitarians. Mr. Dundas and Sir James St. Clair Erskine were directed to prepare and bring in a new bill; and it was read a first and second time on the first of June. Next day it was committed and reported, and on Tuesday after it was read a third time, passed, and carried up to the House of Lords, where it went through the several readings again; and no alteration having been made in it, it received the royal assent on Friday, the 5th of June¹. It is as follows:—

“AN ACT for granting Relief to Pastors, Ministers, and lay-persons of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland. 1. WHEREAS, by several acts of parliament now in force, disabilities, forfeitures, and penalties, have been imposed in certain cases upon persons frequenting, resorting to, or officiating in, certain episcopal chapels and meeting-houses in Scotland: and whereas there is sufficient reason to believe that the pastors, ministers, and laity, of the episcopal communion in Scotland, are now well-attached to his majesty's person, family, and government: and whereas it is just and reasonable that such of them as are willing in a proper manner to manifest such attachment, should receive relief with respect to certain disabilities, &c. in the said acts mentioned: May it therefore

¹ Narrative, 25-27.—Annals, 216-220.

please your majesty, that it may be enacted, that so much of 10 Annæ, c. 7; of 5 Geo. I. c. 29; of 19 Geo. II. c. 38, and of 21 Geo. II. c. 34, as relates to imposing penalties, &c. on persons resorting to episcopal chapels, or officiating therein, shall be, and the same are, hereby repealed. II. That every pastor, &c. shall within six months after the first of July, 1792, or at some time previous to his exercising the said functions, take and subscribe the oaths of Allegiance, Abjuration, and Assurance . . . and shall also subscribe a declaration of his assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England [by a specified form]. III. Every clergyman is obliged to produce a certificate to the proper officer of his having qualified himself by taking and subscribing the said oaths and the said Articles; the clerk of the shire, &c. shall enter these in a book, and send an attested copy to each house of parliament, and grant one to the pastor, &c. to be affixed outside the door of the chapel, &c. IV. A penalty of £20, and suspension for three years, is imposed on the pastor if he officiates without having qualified as above. V. That every pastor, &c. shall pray by name for the king and royal family, as directed in the liturgy of the church of England. VI. A penalty is incurred of £20, and suspension for three years, by any pastor offending in any of the premises. VII. Ministers offending against this act are incapable of voting for members of parliament, or in the election of a magistrate, &c. in the burghs. VIII. The chapel-doors are not to be locked, barred, or bolted, during divine worship. IX. That no pastor or minister of any sort in the episcopal communion in Scotland, shall be capable of taking any benefice, curacy, or other spiritual promotion, within England, &c., or of *officiating* in any church or chapel within the same . . . unless he be lawfully ordained by some bishop of the church of England or of Ireland. X. and XI. A penalty is imposed, of five pounds for the first offence, and imprisonment for six months, and for the second, imprisonment for two years, on every person who has been present twice in one year at divine worship where the king, &c. is not prayed for; but every prosecution must be commenced within the space of twelve months, and not afterwards. XII. No peer of Scotland is capable of being elected one of the sixteen peers, if he has been twice present in the same year at divine service where the king has not been prayed for by name. XIII. No person is capable of electing or being elected a member of the House of Commons who has been twice present in the same year where the king has not been prayed for by name, &c. XIV. This act

shall be deemed, adjudged, and taken to be a public act; and shall be judicially taken notice of as such, by all judges, justices, and other persons whomsoever, without specially pleading the same¹."

QUEEN ANNE'S Act of Toleration still remains in force, or rather its provisions were revived; for it was in abeyance during all the time that the penal statutes were in operation. It protects episcopalian congregations from being disturbed in the exercise of divine worship, by either malicious individuals or by men in authority. The same penalty that was imposed by it, of £20 for neglecting to pray for the sovereign and royal family, is continued in the new act. Registration of letters of orders are not required, and the laity are only required not to be present twice in one year in any place of worship where the royal family are not prayed for. This was an unnecessary precaution, as the prayers for them are read exactly as they stand in the liturgy, and as they are from time to time altered by authority to suit the circumstances of the case. Even when churchmen considered their allegiance due to the exiled prince, they were obedient to the sovereign in possession; but ever since the extinction of that illustrious house, they have not been surpassed by any of their fellow-subjects in loyalty and obedience to the present dynasty. Their tenacious adherence to their native sovereigns, whom God had set over them, should recommend them more decidedly to the sovereign on the throne, as the *principle of loyalty* which prompted their former political conduct remains in full force in their present position. Loyalty is a divine principle founded on the fifth commandment, the fatherhood being the foundation of kingly government; therefore, "to love, honour, and obey the king," or the queen, as at present, "and all that are put in authority under him," according to the apostolic ordinance, is the daily teaching of the reformed Catholic church of Scotland.

NOW BY THE exertions of her chief pastor, and other servants of God, the church, that had so long groaned under affliction and persecution, was delivered from her Babylonian captivity in a peaceable and legal manner. During her long captivity an apostolical succession was preserved; for even in her deepest misery God remembered that He promised to the church of the Jews "a continuance of the kingdom [or church], and the priesthood:"—"For, thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the

please your majesty, that it may be enacted, that so much of 10 Annæ, c. 7; of 5 Geo. I. c. 29; of 19 Geo. II. c. 38, and of 21 Geo. II. c. 34, as relates to imposing penalties, &c. on persons resorting to episcopal chapels, or officiating therein, shall be, and the same are, hereby repealed. II. That every pastor, &c. shall within six months after the first of July, 1792, or at some time previous to his exercising the said functions, take and subscribe the oaths of Allegiance, Abjuration, and Assurance . . . and shall also subscribe a declaration of his assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England [by a specified form]. III. Every clergyman is obliged to produce a certificate to the proper officer of his having qualified himself by taking and subscribing the said oaths and the said Articles; the clerk of the shire, &c. shall enter these in a book, and send an attested copy to each house of parliament, and grant one to the pastor, &c. to be affixed outside the door of the chapel, &c. IV. A penalty of £20, and suspension for three years, is imposed on the pastor if he officiates without having qualified as above. V. That every pastor, &c. shall pray by name for the king and royal family, as directed in the liturgy of the church of England. VI. A penalty is incurred of £20, and suspension for three years, by any pastor offending in any of the premises. VII. Ministers offending against this act are incapable of voting for members of parliament, or in the election of a magistrate, &c. in the burghs. VIII. The chapel-doors are not to be locked, barred, or bolted, during divine worship. IX. That no pastor or minister of any sort in the episcopal communion in Scotland, shall be capable of taking any benefice, curacy, or other spiritual promotion, within England, &c., or of *officiating* in any church or chapel within the same . . . unless he be lawfully ordained by some bishop of the church of England or of Ireland. X. and XI. A penalty is imposed, of five pounds for the first offence, and imprisonment for six months, and for the second, imprisonment for two years, on every person who has been present twice in one year at divine worship where the king, &c. is not prayed for; but every prosecution must be commenced within the space of twelve months, and not afterwards. XII. No peer of Scotland is capable of being elected one of the sixteen peers, if he has been twice present in the same year at divine service where the king has not been prayed for by name. XIII. No person is capable of electing or being elected a member of the House of Commons who has been twice present in the same year where the king has not been prayed for by name, &c. XIV. This act

shall be deemed, adjudged, and taken to be a public act; and shall be judicially taken notice of as such, by all judges, justices, and other persons whomsoever, without specially pleading the same¹."

QUEEN ANNE'S Act of Toleration still remains in force, or rather its provisions were revived; for it was in abeyance during all the time that the penal statutes were in operation. It protects episcopalian congregations from being disturbed in the exercise of divine worship, by either malicious individuals or by men in authority. The same penalty that was imposed by it, of £20 for neglecting to pray for the sovereign and royal family, is continued in the new act. Registration of letters of orders are not required, and the laity are only required not to be present twice in one year in any place of worship where the royal family are not prayed for. This was an unnecessary precaution, as the prayers for them are read exactly as they stand in the liturgy, and as they are from time to time altered by authority to suit the circumstances of the case. Even when churchmen considered their allegiance due to the exiled prince, they were obedient to the sovereign in possession; but ever since the extinction of that illustrious house, they have not been surpassed by any of their fellow-subjects in loyalty and obedience to the present dynasty. Their tenacious adherence to their native sovereigns, whom God had set over them, should recommend them more decidedly to the sovereign on the throne, as the *principle of loyalty* which prompted their former political conduct remains in full force in their present position. Loyalty is a divine principle founded on the fifth commandment, the fatherhood being the foundation of kingly government; therefore, "to love, honour, and obey the king," or the queen, as at present, "and all that are put in authority under him," according to the apostolic ordinance, is the daily teaching of the reformed Catholic church of Scotland.

NOW BY THE exertions of her chief pastor, and other servants of God, the church, that had so long groaned under affliction and persecution, was delivered from her Babylonian captivity in a peaceable and legal manner. During her long captivity an apostolical succession was preserved; for even in her deepest misery God remembered that He promised to the church of the Jews "a continuance of the kingdom [or church], and the priesthood:"—"For, thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the

house of Israel; neither shall the priests, the Levites, want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and *to do sacrifice continually.*" It is plain, from the contents of the chapters, that the church understands both this prophecy, and also the corresponding one of Isaiah, to mean the christian church, of which that now relieved from oppression is a lively member—"And I will take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord. For as the *new heavens* [the evangelical church] and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain;" for "the Gentiles shall have an holy church." We that can now sit under our own vine and fig-tree, ought to keep the memory of bishop John Skinner, and his associates, in grateful remembrance, for God raised them up to lead His people out of the house of bondage¹.

AN ANECDOTE of bishop Horne is related by Mr. Fabre, when he is speaking of whether or not the Roman church be a *true* church. "It is within the bounds of *possibility* that an individual may be a *REAL bishop*, and yet a *very bad man*: or still more paradoxically in verbal appearance, inasmuch as the same ambiguity attends upon the word *GOOD*, a *very bad man* may be a *perfectly GOOD bishop*. The late amiable bishop Horne, of Norwich, with the kindly playful humour which distinguished him, very happily drew from the ambiguity of this latter word a well-merited compliment to the Scottish bishops, who waited upon him in the day of their honourable depression for conscience-sake. 'Your lordship, I am sure, will allow, that at least we are *GOOD bishops*,' said one of their number. 'Much *BETTER bishops than myself, gentlemen, I am quite persuaded,*' was the prompt and felicitously delicate reply. Yet the reply turned upon the very *equivoque* which I have pointed out²."

¹ Jeremiah, xxxiii. 17, 18.—Isaiah, lxvi. 21, 22; and the Table of Contents of both chapters.

² Christ's Discourse at Capernaum fatal to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Note on page 38.

CHAPTER LXXVI.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN SKINNER,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS,

1.—Bishop Skinner's Return.—A general convention summoned.—The independent congregations—the one in Banff added to the church.—Convention meets at Laurencekirk—transactions—Widows' Fund—consecration of Bishop Watson.—An episcopal synod.—Aberdeen diocesan synod—their resolution.—Rev. R. Aitkin's letter.—Number and position of episcopalians.—1793.—French Revolution—Republic—a striking coincidence.—Affiliated societies.—Declaration of the bishops—a determination to heal the independent schism—attempt at Edinburgh.—Rev. Jonathan Boucher.—Widows' Fund.—1794.—Mr. Donald Mackintosh.—A brief for collections.—Extracts from the Register of the Charitable Fund.—1795.—Address to the throne.—1796.—Coadjutor in the bishoprick of Moray—Mr. Jolly proposed.—Rejected to—consecrated.—1797-98.—Appointed bishop of Moray.—The assembly's admonition.—1799.—Rowland Hill.—Mr. Simeon.—Act of assembly.—Oath of abjuration.

792.—AFTER EFFECTING the liberation of the church, bishop Skinner returned to Aberdeen on the 4th of July. It was suggested to the primus that it might be expedient to summon a convention of the whole church, and to lay before it a narrative of the measures that had been so wisely and successfully adopted for the relief of the church from the operation of the persecuting statutes of the first two Georges; and at the same time to devise some means for raising a sufficient sum for defraying the expenses attending the recent journies to London, and the passing of their bill through parliament. In compliance with this suggestion, the primus summoned a general convention of the whole clergy to be holden at Laurencekirk on Wednesday, the 28th day of August, for the purpose, "First, receiving their committee's report of the proceedings adopted in carrying through the act of repeal; secondly, on

deliberating on an address to his majesty. And, lastly, of devising a plan for establishing a fund for the support of the widows and children of episcopal clergymen in Scotland." Each congregation was directed to send a lay-delegate, and when from circumstances that could not be done, then they might appoint their priest as their proxy to act in their name. It was also stated in the circular, that "as the applications to parliament have been attended with considerable expense, it has been judged most equitable and expedient to raise a sum for defraying the same by public collection or private contribution in the different congregations throughout the church, previous to the meeting of the convention, when, it is hoped, you will bring with you, or send to the convention, the sum or sums which your congregation shall be pleased to contribute for the purpose aforesaid; the overplus (if any), after paying the expense incurred, to be employed for the general advantage of the church, in the manner the convention shall direct¹."

THE SMALL END of the schismatical wedge had been inserted by Queen Anne's toleration act, commonly called "the tenth of Queen Anne," which required registration of orders and subscription to oaths, &c.² These conditions being contrary to the principles by which they had all along acted, could not be taken, and therefore that schism commenced to which we have already alluded, of gentlemen obtaining orders from English bishops, and gathering congregations *independent* of the bishops in whose dioceses they settled. This schism made but small progress till after the enactment of the persecuting statutes, when the laity being involved in the act of extirpation, these independent congregations became numerous, and carried off all the middling and upper classes from the church. Both the clergy and the people of these independent meetings became the most bitter and implacable political enemies of the church, the members of which had all along been denominated *non-jurors*. Their introduction, says Mr. Skinner, "which at first took place with a view to brotherly assistance, *has conduced more than* avowed enmity would have done *to depress that episcopacy* which, waving *political* scruples, the English bishops have at all times acknowledged to be orthodox and valid³." As mentioned, p. 426, there was one of these independent meeting-houses at Banff, which at this time was served by the Mr. Cordiner who had been ordained in Arbroath by the bishop of Down and Connor.

¹ Skinner's Annals, 233, 234.

² Vide iv. ch. lxi., p. 78.

³ Ecclesiastical History, ii. 678.

No sooner was the Repeal Act passed, than this worthy man set the blessed example of healing the schism, and united himself and his congregation to the church, by recognizing and submitting to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Aberdeen, some time in the month of July. There was also a small chapel in the same place, containing a handful of the faithful, which now united with the former, and became one congregation, both clergymen officiating together for some time¹.

THE CONVENTION met at Laurencekirk on the 22d of August; the Primus was elected to the chair. He opened the business of the meeting, and declared, that as it was of purely a civil nature, it was not to be considered as any precedent for an ecclesiastical synod. Bishop Skinner then read a long report, and went over all the provisions of the bill, explaining each, but particularly the restrictive clause, which presented the most offensive aspect to his audience. He expressed himself 'at a loss to determine whether we have or have not reason to complain of it. Time will shew how it is likely to operate, and I would fain hope that there is as much probability of its being friendly, as of its being prejudicial to the interests of our church.' He showed that the oath of abjuration was forced upon them by the obstinacy of Thurlow. "Here it was that our opposers took their firmest ground; and here it was that the lord chancellor of England fixed his foot,—that the highest officer of the crown entrenched himself in such a manner, that after various attempts to dislodge him, it was found necessary to drop all thoughts of a commutation of the oaths." As regards the clause in the act which enforces subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, he continues—the Articles "seem to have been considered by the British senate as that confessional of christian doctrine, which, being best entitled to establishment in England, is most 'fit to be tolerated' in Scotland; and we having professed our communion with the Church of England, there really appears to me no hardship in our clergy being required, as the law directs, to acknowledge that the Articles of that church 'are agreeable to the Word of God².'"

AFTER A SHORT adjournment the Primus left the chair, and the Convention having formed itself into a committee, the very Rev. Patrick Rose, dean of Brechin, took the chair, and a vote of thanks was unanimously, and most justly, given to the committee of delegates, but in particular to bishop Skinner, whose exertions had been mainly instrumental in procuring

¹ Annals, 242.

² Ibid. 248-251.

the repeal of the persecuting statutes. On investigation, it appeared that the collections amounted to £305. 0s. 9d., and that the expense attending the delegation to London, and the passing of the act, amounted to £213. 12s. After paying this sum, there remained a balance of £91. 8s. 9d., to be disposed of at the discretion of the Convention. It was deposited in the hands of the Primus, to be placed at interest, for the benefit of the widows and children of the clergy. This was the commencement of a Widows' Fund, which, by careful nursing, has since accumulated to a handsome sum.

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE of Dunkeld elected the Rev. Jonathan Watson, incumbent of Laurencekirk, to be their bishop; and the dean of that diocese transmitted a regular deed of election to the Primus. The bishops therefore met at Stonehaven, and Mr. Watson was consecrated in that town by bishop Skinner, assisted by bishops Macfarlane, Abernethy Drummond, and Strachan, and appointed bishop of Dunkeld¹. Immediately after the consecration these five bishops formed themselves into an episcopal synod, and agreed to an address to the king, in consequence of a proclamation that had been issued by government for preventing those tumultuous meetings and seditious writings which the events of the French Revolution had excited. Their address was very graciously received, and an answer was transmitted to the Primus by Mr. Dundas².

THE PRIMUS drew the attention of his own diocesan synod, which met at Aberdeen on the 7th of November, to the late act of parliament, and requested them to come to some resolution regarding it that might be entered on their minutes, and communicated to the other districts of the church. The synod accordingly came to the following resolution:—"At a diocesan synod, holden at Aberdeen on the 7th of November, 1792, the bishop and clergy of this diocese, finding that on taking the act of parliament lately passed for the relief of this church into consideration, they cannot, consistently with the principles which they have ever espoused, take and subscribe all the oaths required by that act, by which means they are precluded from an opportunity of giving their public assent to the truth of the Thirty-nine Articles of religion received in the church of England, and which, from their brotherly affection to that church, they are much inclined to give, they think themselves called upon to declare, in this synodical manner, that they will, on all proper occasions, testify to the world in

¹ Annals, 257.—Perceval's Apology, 255.

² Annals, 259.

and to the members of this church in particular, that various opinions may be, and always have been, entered into the interpretation of some of those Articles, yet they are the doctrines proposed in the same to be agreeable to the will of God¹." The oath of abjuration was an obstacle put in the way against the principles that had actuated the people since the Revolution; and as that oath is now *without* it might be expedient to remove it entirely. This earned a letter of thanks to the Christian Knowledge Society for a handsome donation of Prayer Books, which had recently been given to the church.

CORRESPONDENCE previously noticed betwixt a clergyman of the reformed Catholic church of Scotland and an agent, stimulated the Rev. Roger Aitken, of Aberdeen, to an illiberal attack of the latter. One of the charges, he says, is *Jacobitism*. "If by this term Clericus means that we are the abettors of tyranny, and would have seen to see arbitrary power raised on the ruins of the constitution of our country, Clericus knows as little of the matter as he does of the *religion* of the Scotch episcopalsians." After Mr. Aitken gives some interesting statistical information, he says that it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to procure otherwise. He says—"I come now, Mr. Aitken, to the point which first drew Clericus into the field; and which, to him, seems, of all others, the most important to offer itself to the attention of a minister of the gospel; namely, the number, the wealth, and the rank of his hearers. With us a matter of no consideration at all where duty is concerned, I shall give a very short answer to all that your agent has said. In the diocese of Aberdeen there are *two thousand communicants*; a number, which, by his own admission, is only *one* thousand less than *the whole of the English communion put together*. That thousand, and more, is found under any other of our bishops. With regard to the number, rank, and wealth of the English communion, I have nothing to differ from him. The view he has given of its congregations is much, very much embellished; and partly from what I myself have seen of them, having been in every town of Scotland where there is an English [Lutheran] chapel, and partly from the information I have received from others, who had opportunities of knowing. But the legislature, upon our application, shall be pleased

¹ Annals, 260.

to think that our clergy ought to be allowed to perform their functions, without being liable to imprisonment and banishment, whenever their *neighbours* shall think fit to inform against them, and their hearers to attend their ministrations without being exposed to fines, forfeitures, and disabilities, shall Clericus and his friends put their negative upon it, by telling both houses of parliament that the Scotch clergy are only a parcel of 'cobblers,' their hearers the dregs of the people, and that to allow us to say our prayers in peace and safety would be '*an insult upon the whole body of English clergymen, and their respectable congregations in Scotland?*' That our hearers should be few and mean, need not be wondered at, when the nature of the penal laws is considered; yet they are neither so few, so mean, nor so poor, as Clericus says, or as he could wish. We number among our people both the rich and the noble. Our houses of worship . . . are in *all* places decent; in some they are executed with as much taste and elegance as our *present* situation will admit of. But, confined as our situation is, our chapels are daily improving. In this diocese [Aberdeen] one is now building, and nearly finished, under the direction of a noble lord, a man of letters, and of a very patriotic spirit. In the diocese of Brechin, another chapel, on an elegant plan, is erecting, by the liberality of a learned judge, assisted by the first characters of the county, one of whom is a noble earl. And, besides building, the learned judge has amply endowed his chapel. This is a proof of the *innocence* of our principles—stronger than a thousand arguments; a proof that we are not *papists* and *impostors*, nor our principles 'treated with perfect abhorrence and contempt.' It has been hinted by your correspondent that 'some of the English bishops wish to exert their good offices in uniting the two orders.' I am extremely happy to hear it. . . . Episcopal clergymen ought certainly to act upon episcopal principles. It is an object which merits the attention of that pious and learned bench, to heal divisions, especially such as subsist without any seeming cause; and to extend this 'labour of love' is worthy of that zeal which gave a regular episcopacy to the new world, and which, while the annals of this century are preserved, will shed the most refulgent splendour on the archiepiscopate of Dr. Moore. There will be no impediment thrown in the way of the proposed union by the Scotch bishops, for I am sure they will prescribe no other conditions to the clergy of the other communion than to acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and to

promise canonical obedience to their respective ordinaries.
—(Signed) ROGER AITKEN¹.”

1793.—IN THE YEAR 1789, the “EARTHQUAKE²” predicted by St. John commenced; and in it fell a TENTH part of the great Roman city—that is to say, the French monarchy, which was the only HORN remaining of the ten primary kingdoms, or horns, into which the Roman empire had been divided. In this tremendous earthquake, the apocalyptic prophet adds, there “were slain seven thousand names of men.” In common earthquakes, or political revolutions, *men* alone are ordinarily slain; but in the tremendous explosion of this revolution, their very *names* were extirpated. Their number is said to be seven thousand, which is the usual apocalyptic manner of describing a *great multitude*. In this awful earthquake, not merely the names or titles of nobility in general were proscribed, but precisely seven names or titles were abolished—viz. 1. Prince; 2. Duke; 3. Marquis; 4. Count; 5. Viscount; 6. Bishop; and 7. Baron;—thus fulfilling the sure word of prophecy. “The *second* WOE is past, and behold the THIRD WOE cometh *quickly*.” The first shock of the earthquake took place in the year 1789; but the last and most terrible occurred on the 10th of August, 1792. Antichrist now stood revealed in all his horrors; and the long-continued impieties of popery were constrained to hide their diminished heads in the presence of such a gigantic monster, who alike trampled on the laws of man and defied the majesty of heaven. On the 12th and 26th of August, the French republic exalted itself above all human and divine law, in the abolition of all distinctions of civil society, and in the establishment of atheism by law. All the clergy were ordered to quit the kingdom within a fortnight; but instead of allowing them the time specified by their own decree, the jacobin republic employed the whole of that period in seizing, imprisoning, and putting them to the most cruel deaths. No traces of christianity could now be found in that atheistical country. One of the churches was converted into a den of harlots, where a wretched prostitute was enthroned on the altar to represent Liberty. There the abandoned and atheistical *citizens* of Paris flocked in crowds to hear the name of their Creator blasphemed. In October, 1793, all the external signs of religion were abolished, and *death* declared to be “*an eternal sleep*.” The Lord’s-day was set aside, and a new calendar was

¹ Gentleman’s Magazine, vol. lxii. anno 1792, pp. 331, 332.

² REVELATIONS, xi. 13.

adopted ; and in June, the following year, the convention decreed that there was nothing criminal in the promiscuous commerce of the sexes ; thus establishing *fornication* by law¹. “ It was at this time remarked,” says Mr. Skinner, “ as a singular coincidence, that the French revolution should have burst forth one hundred years exactly from the date of the revolution, which, in 1688, took place in Great Britain ; and that at the very period when Frenchmen were ready to have once more embroiled this happy land in civil war, it should have so happened that the last remaining branch of the house of Stuart who could dispute the succession of the reigning family, should have been most providentially removed by death, and thus the whole British nation left to obey the dictates of conscience, and, with one heart and one soul, vigorously to repel the assaults of any foreign foe. From the moment that the account of the demise of Charles Edward . . . reached Scotland, from that moment jacobitism became, like a dead man, out of mind ; every tongue was eager to swear fealty and allegiance to the house of Brunswick, and every arm to protect and defend the constitution of Great Britain, as by law established².”

THE FRENCH CONVENTION affected to take offence at the British government for putting the empire in a state of defence, and immediately declared war. The French jacobins maintained a secret correspondence with affiliated societies in the British dominions, and the knowledge of this excited the loyalty of the great mass of the people, who came forward with addresses to the throne expressive of their abhorrence of the levelling and atheistical principles which were disseminated by these affiliated traitors. Declarations of loyalty were respectively issued by the bishops and clergy of the dioceses of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Ross and Moray, and Dunkeld and Dunblane ; “ all vying with each other in expressions of honest indignation at the conduct of France, and of their determination to resist and oppose her contaminating principles to the utmost of their power.” The king ordered a public fast to be observed throughout Scotland on the 18th of April, “ for deprecating, in the most fervent manner, the calamities that the sins of the nation deserve, and humbly to implore His merciful protection of the British empire from the principles, as well as from the power, of that deluded people with whom this country is now engaged in a just and necessary war³.”

¹ Faber's Dissertation on the Prophecies, ii. 107-131.

² Annals, 261.

³ Declaration of the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Aberdeen, cited in Annals, 262, 264.

IT PLEASED GOD to inspire the primus with a firm determination to heal the unhappy political schism which the state persecution of the church had produced; and he brought the whole energies of his great mind to bear upon the subject. The wealthier and titled members of the church were choked with the cares, riches, and pleasures of this life; in them the good seed had fallen among thorns, and, when persecution came, their love waxed cold, and therefore they set up independent altars against the altar of the Lord. They had the plea of political expediency for the perpetration of this unnatural schism; and as all political obstacles were now removed, the primus conceived the design, and eventually most happily accomplished the task, of bringing back these prodigal children from the husks of expediency to the household of faith. He first began with the independent clergy of Edinburgh, and as a preliminary, with the concurrence of bishop Watson, he made the proposal to bishop Abernethy Drummond to resign the diocese of Edinburgh in favour of the rev. Jonathan Boucher, then vicar of Epsom, who might be consecrated in Scotland and appointed to the see of Edinburgh. This proposal met with the approbation of the clergy of that diocese, and the frank and cordial concurrence of the bishop of Edinburgh himself. Mr. Skinner says, "bishop Abernethy Drummond, with a zeal and humbleness of mind which would have been an honour to any prelate of any age, assured bishop Skinner that he 'most cheerfully adopted the plan which he and bishop Watson proposed, and would immediately resign in favour of the worthy vicar of Epsom, if he should be so good as to accept the see of Edinburgh.'" Mr. Boucher accepted the offer, and, in prosecution of the design, came to Edinburgh; but a vulgar alarm was at once excited, "that the scheme in agitation was to introduce bishops into Scotland without the sanction of government, and on such a legal footing as to entitle them to some legal jurisdiction." This senseless clamour disgusted Mr. Boucher, the plan was abandoned, and he returned to his vicarage, where he soon after died¹.

THE BISHOP and clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen took advantage of the act of parliament which was passed this year, for the encouragement of Friendly Societies; and they procured an extension of it to "the Scottish episcopal clergy, their widows and orphans, and indigent members." Articles and addresses were accordingly drawn up, and circulated among the clergy for correction and approbation, with a circular notice

¹ Annals, 265-271.

from the primus, that a general meeting of such bishops and clergy as were desirous of becoming members of the society would be held at Aberdeen on the 19th of November. At this meeting, a Friendly Society, in terms of the act of parliament, was formed, and articles and rules for its government were sanctioned and signed by the primus and the diocesan clerk, and by them presented to his majesty's justices for the county, for their confirmation. Since that time the society has continued to flourish "beyond what the most sanguine of its institutors could have anticipated. From the sum of £10 annually to the widows of deceased members, and the sum of £100 to the orphan family (if no widow existed), the annuity of each widow is now [1818] increased to £20, and the sum given to an orphan family £200, notwithstanding that the individual members of the society have never been assessed in a sum above £2 yearly, and that only for the space of ten years from their admission. The liberality of lay contributions at the time of its commencement, and the admirable management under which the Scottish Friendly Society has been for twenty-four years conducted, are gratefully acknowledged as the causes which have led to this beneficial result¹."

1794.—THE ECCENTRIC Mr. Donald Macintosh, already mentioned, early in this year brought an action before the court of session, against the managers of the "Fund belonging to the episcopal clergy in Scotland, for behoof of their indigent brethren, their widows, and children;" being "in the full persuasion that in *his* person centred the sole right of the episcopal non-juring clergy, being the last, as he believed, of that distinguished body of ecclesiastics who protested against a foreign succession and the whiggish principles of a British hierarchy. The issue of this singular case was what might have been expected. When it came under discussion, the lord president, sir Hay Campbell, facetiously remarked to his brethren on the bench, that 'he was at a loss whether to frown at the audaciousness of the pursuer, or to smile at the high pitch of folly of his witless advisers, in wantonly thrusting a plea of so extraordinary a nature into his majesty's supreme court of justice. What! a person claiming a right, in virtue of his refractory adherence to obsolete opinion, long since exploded; nay, glorying in his disloyalty to the best of kings and to the existing government!' After a good deal of the same kind of ludicrous discussion, Mr. Macintosh was non-

¹ Annals, 272.

suites, and they who aided him were much chagrined and greatly disappointed. Albeit, after this defeat, he fearlessly pursued [what he imagined] his path of duty, making extensive excursions on foot among his widely scattered flock; many of whom had vanished from his sight, but were not lost, having joined those who are ‘gathered into one fold under one shepherd¹.’”

BISHOP SKINNER drew up a brief, which was approved of and signed by all the other bishops, and ordered to be read by all the clergy, from their pulpits, on the fourth Sunday in Lent; and those who, from the scarcity and poverty of the clergy, served at two chapels, were to read it on the fifth Sunday in Lent at their second charges. It narrates the distress and destitution into which the clergy were cast by the Revolution, “many of whom were driven to the utmost extremity of want, could not fail to excite the compassion of well-disposed christians, especially of those who were inclined to consider them as suffering for the sake of a good conscience. Among such persons, applications were proposed and carried on with considerable success. Public contributions were made in various places, and donations received from private hands, for the support of the suffering clergy. . . . It was to supply the want of a decent subsistence, as well as to hold out some small but permanent relief to the widows and orphans of such of the clergy as died in indigent circumstances, that the plan of a charitable fund was first thought of. . . . Yielding to the necessity of the times, and influenced by various motives, the persons to whom the care of the fund was committed have allowed it to be almost totally exhausted; and that that remains of it can allow but a scanty provision to the widows of those who were formerly benefited by it. The poorer clergy are already deprived of its assistance, and no future widows or orphans can expect any relief from it.” The brief then states, that collections will be made for a few years only, in order to bring up the funds of this society to such an amount as will enable the governors to give assistance, at an early period, to the widows and orphans of the clergy². I have now,” says bishop Walker, “before me, ‘the Register of the Administration of the Charitable Contributions for the Indigent Episcopal Clergy, and their Widows,’ from October 1754, to August 1788. In the annual list, among many other worthy men, I find Mr. Greig, of Stonehaven, from year to year, under the head ‘pro tempore precepts,’ *six crowns*;

¹ Life of Macintosh, Ep. Mag.

² Annals, 273-281.

some years raised to *nine*. I find also the name of Mr. Gibb, of Turriff, and, after his death, of his widow, with *ten crowns* assigned. In the same list I find the names of GEORGE GLIE and ALEXANDER JOLLY, with grants equally limited, because the claims were numerous and *urgent*. The two names which I have thus united, born in the same town, educated at the same school, and, though in different colleges, in what may be deemed the same university, would reflect credit on the most splendid church establishment. Yet did they each take his lot in a church so poorly endowed as to render the scanty aids which I have mentioned important and necessary, at least for a time. They made their election freely, and amidst all the difficulties and privations in the first period of their ministry, they felt no regret. Their attachment continued steadily increasing with their years and experience¹."

1795.—THE BISHOPS and clergy transmitted an address to the throne, in consequence of the king having been attacked, in his way to open parliament on the 29th of October, by a tumultuous and lawless mob. The address very justly ascribed that insult as flowing from the seditious associations and treasonable publications which then abounded; and in the accompanying letter, the primus assured Mr Dundas of his own, his colleagues', and the clergy's earnest desire, "to promote, as far as lies in their power, the salutary intention of those wise and prudent measures which government is adopting for the better preservation of his majesty's person and authority, and thereby securing more and more the happiness of the kingdom²."

1796.—THE BISHOP of Ross, Argyle, and Moray, represented to his colleagues the necessity, and strenuously urged the expediency, of appointing a coadjutor to him in his widely extended charge; not so much on account of the numerous congregations, for there were only nine in all the three dioceses, as the immense distances at which they were situate. Bishop Macfarlane proposed Mr. Jolly, incumbent of the chapel at Frasersburgh, to the priests of the diocese of Moray, who duly elected him as a fit person to fill the office of coadjutor-bishop for their diocesan. The primus, however, looking not to the man, but to the *propriety* of the measure at that particular time, and in the existing condition of the church, opposed and protested against Mr. Jolly's consecration. "If any thing were needed to show how steadily that venerable man

¹ Life of Bishop Jolly, prefixed to his Sunday Services, p. 8, 9.

² Annals, 283.

bishop Skinner], in every part of his administration as primus, looked with a single eye to the good of the church, it could be in this very opposition of his to the elevation of one whom the common voice pronounced worthy of the episcopate." The primus's protest and opposition arose not "from any objection to the man, whom he ever highly and heartily esteemed," but "on the special ground that it was unnecessary in the then circumstances of the church." Bishop Skinner's objections were overruled by his colleagues; nevertheless they were invincible, and time shewed the justice of them. "To the learning, the piety, and the strictly clerical deportment of the coadjutor elect, he bore ample testimony; but as the succession was then sufficiently strong, and as, in the view of things, additional *clergymen* were more wanted in the highlands of Scotland than the aid of an additional and non-resident bishop, who, though in most respects eminently qualified for the office, was confessedly ignorant of the Gaelic language, the primus refused to sanction the choice of the clergy of Ross and Moray, or to give his concurrence to the present promotion of a coadjutor to bishop Macfarlane¹." The other bishops, however, esteemed Mr. Jolly's primitive manners and theological acquirements sufficient to counterbalance the primus's special objections. And the majority, therefore, acting under the authority of the second section of the canons of 1743², assembled in synod in Dundee, on the eve of St. John the Baptist's Day, and there chose the bishop of Edinburgh their primus *pro hac vice*. On the following day, the 24th of June, being the feast of St. John the Baptist, Mr. Jolly was consecrated, without regard to the absence and protest of the primus, by bishop Abernethy Drummond, the temporary primus, assisted by bishops Macfarlane and Buchanan³. A priest informed the writer of this that he slept in the same room with bishop Jolly the night previous to his consecration; and that when that venerable man thought himself to be asleep, he rose soon after midnight, dressed himself, and continued on his knees in prayer till morning.

1797-98.—MEN, says the author of the *Annals of Scottish Episcopacy*, "like bishop Skinner, whose opposition to the measures of brethren in office originate in a sense of duty, without any selfish or sinister objects, cherish no resentments. To his colleagues individually, as well as collectively, the

¹ *Annals*, 283.

² *Vide ante*, vol. iv. ch. lxix. p. 295.

³ *Keith's Cat.* App. 543. — *Bishop Walker's Life of Jolly*. — *Mr. Cheyne's Memoirs*. — *Annals*, 284. — *Perceval*, 255. — *Private Letter*.

right hand of fellowship was speedily extended; and as no man experienced, through bishop Skinner's life, more of his brotherly regard than the bishop of Moray, so did no man more cordially lament the loss sustained by himself, and the church at large, in the primus's sudden demise, than that venerable prelate¹." Bishop Jolly continued coadjutor to bishop Macfarlane till February 1798, but he had never officiated as bishop in the diocese; a circumstance which shews the propriety of bishop Skinner's objections to his elevation to the episcopate, at the particular time when he was consecrated. Bishop Walker cites an "N. B." from the Register of the Episcopal College, which states, that "in consequence of bishop Macfarlane's resignation, bishop Jolly was unanimously elected to Moray, February 14th, 1798, and regularly collated to that charge, on the 22d of the said month, by the primus and all his colleagues." The ancient diocese of Moray was then disjoined from that of Ross, to which, since bishop Dunbar's resignation, it had been united. At that time there were but four congregations in the whole bishoprick, viz. Elgin and Duffus, both served by one priest, Huntly, and Keith².

THE COMMISSION OF THE General Assembly of the kirk issued a most excellent and well-digested "warning and admonition to the people of Scotland," upon the extraordinary state of public affairs; and the ministers were directed to read it from their respective pulpits on Thursday, the 8th of March, 1798, being the day appointed for a national fast, or on the first Lord's day after it came to their hands. One of the paragraphs contains the following—"In the arduous contest in which we are at present engaged, we have not as yet met with any national disaster; but whilst the other states of Europe, intimidated by the progress of the French arms, are bending under the yoke, we have hitherto been able to protect our commerce, and to ward off the hostilities which have been directed against our shores. While, brethren, you celebrate the gallantry of our seamen, the vigilance and activity of our naval administration, the skill and alertness of our commanders; while you honour with daily expressions of your good will the illustrious heroes who led to victory, and pay every tribute to the memory of the brave and faithful men who fell in the cause of their country;—amidst the acknowledgments due to human exertions, look up to Him whom the winds and the sea

¹ Annals, 284.

² Bishop Walker's Life of Bishop Jolly, 12, 13.—Annals, 284.

ey. Recollect the circumstances which render the time and measure of a naval victory completely dependent on the will of heaven. In the train of success which has attended round the globe, mark the continued interposition of Providence for our defence ; and after the examples of the noble admirals, who, in the presence of their sovereign, presented on the altars of God the colours which have been won in great naval engagements of this war, let all ranks of men unite in saying, ‘ Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name be the glory ¹.’ ”

1799.—THAT ECCENTRIC and schismatical personage, Rowland Hill, had preached in several of the established kirks, and, moreover, threatened another visit for a similar purpose. To prevent his intrusion, and that of Mr. Simeon of Cambridge, and others, who were not qualified to preach in the established pulpits, the Assembly passed a very necessary Declaratory Act, respecting unqualified ministers and preachers, in which such wandering stars are very properly most peremptorily prohibited from preaching in any of the kirks or chapels of ease. The Assembly “ do hereby discharge and prohibit, under pain of such censures as the judicatories of this church may see fit to inflict, all the ministers of this church, and the ministers of all chapels of ease connected therewith, from employing to preach upon any occasion, or to dispense any of the other ordinances of the gospel, within any congregation under the jurisdiction of this church, persons who are not qualified, according to the laws of this church, to accept of a presentation, and from holding ministerial communion in any other manner with such persons. And the General Assembly do hereby enjoin all presbyteries of this church to attend to any transgression of this prohibition which may occur within their bounds, and to summon the minister who is reported as being guilty of such transgression, to answer for his conduct ². ” This censorious act has incurred the wrath of Hetherington, who says, “ By this act, such men as Rowland Hill, and Simeon Cambridge, were expressly aimed at, and excluded from the pulpit in the established church of Scotland, not because they were episcopalians, but because their doctrine was evangelical ; for the act was moved, carried, and enforced by the liberal party, contrary to the feelings and wishes of their evangelical opponents ³. ”

HERE WAS a littleness of mind and a meanness of character

¹ Acts of Assembly, Appendix, p. 1158.

² Ibid, 869.

³ Hetherington's History, 229.

is position. The great and the wealthy had for the most part deserted their mother in her distress, and none of the sons whom she had reared took her by the hand in the hour of her greatest suffering, that they might not lose their civil and political rights, of which they would have been deprived had they conspired with the ministers of the desolate and persecuted church of their fathers. They felt no pity at seeing her in the midst, nor of seeing the fire of presbytery and of independency consuming" or enticing away her young men, her priests slain with the sword of poverty, whilst there were no widows to make lamentation. "So the Lord awaked, as one out of sleep, and was a giant refreshed with wine." To all human appearance the church seemed to have been utterly "extirpated," root and branch; and each zealous priest might almost have said with the prophet of old, "The children of the kingdom have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down Thine altars," set up schismatical independency against them, and thy prophets have been slain with the sword of poverty; "and I, even I only, am left." But there were still seven thousand left who had not bowed their knees to presbytery, nor kissed independency. And at this time of its lowest depression He raised up a man to govern and lead his church with a faithful and true heart; and gave him a heart to conceive, and a hand to effect, not only the release of the church from oppression and bondage, but also the restoration of those who had separated from her in the hour of her distress. Whilst the church was struggling with external evils, she maintained the catholic doctrine of the holy eucharist, and thus shed the light of truth in her dwellings; whilst those by whom she was surrounded fell into the darkness of Socinianism, and denied the Lord that bought them. This might be easily pre-
 cated, from the antinomian nature of the Westminster Confession of Faith; but we have it confessed by their own historian. He says, "during above ten years, the west country was fiercely agitated with polemical controversy between these Socinians and their sounder brethren. The Socinian party were termed *New Light* men, and their opponents were called the defenders of the *Old Light*. In this controversy, as was to be expected, every person of irreligious or immoral character espoused the cause of the *New Light*, or Socinian party¹." Doubting and disputing against the Word of God is unbelief proceeding from the heart and affections, for "all men have not faith," and consequently do not obey the will of God; *faith* and *obedience* being convertible terms.

¹ Hetherington's History, p. 226.

CHAPTER LXXVII

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. JOHN SKINNER,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

—

PRIMUS SCOTIE EPISCOPUS.

1800.—Address to the throne.—1801.—St. James's Crucifix.—Letter to the earl of Errol—his reply.—Rev. J. Stephen's letter.—Bishop Skinner's address.—1802.—Address on the power of Ananias.—Diocesan synod of Aberdeen.—Proposal for union.—Bishop Skinner's opinion.—Circular letter.—1803.—An address to the city on the war, and to the king.—Principal Campbell's lectures—answered.—Bishop Skinner's work, *Primitive Truth and Order*, recommended.—Two clergymen and their congregations join the church.—1804.—A movement in Edinburgh towards union.—Diocesan synod in Aberdeen.—A convocation.—Rev. Dr. Sandford.—Laureneck Kirk.—Bishop Drummond resigns the see of Edinburgh.—Bishop Jolly's address.—Mr. Skinner's speech.—Preamble to the subscription of the XXXIX articles.—The articles subscribed.—Communion office.—Cause of the late schism stated.—The nature of schism—and its danger.

1800.—THE NINETEENTH century opened with brighter prospects to the church than she had experienced since the Revolution. A man of tried abilities, of ardent piety, and indefatigable in business, was providentially at her head, with the firm determination to gather her scattered and disjointed members into her communion. The only transaction that has been recorded in this year is an address to the throne by the bishops and clergy of the catholic church of Scotland, in consequence of the attempt of one Hatfield, a lunatic, who fired a pistol at the king, on the 15th of May, in Drury Lane Theatre. Addresses of congratulation were transmitted from all parts of the empire, and the primus and his colleagues were among the first to testify their unshaken loyalty, and their firm determination “to persevere in impressing on the minds of those who adhere to their ministry, a just sense of what they in duty owe to the prince whom God has set over them, and in gratitude to one of the best sovereigns whom

King of kings has vouchsafed to a highly favoured people¹."

301.—A VERY SIMPLE circumstance was productive of considerable effect. Sir William Forbes, Bart. of Pitsligo, this year presented the rev. John Gleig, who was priest at Woodhead, in the parish of Cruden and diocese of Aberdeen, to his chapel in the village of Pitsligo, in the same diocese. In the same parish of Cruden, the earl of Errol had built St. James's independent chapel, to which he appointed his own chaplain, an English gentleman, the rev. John Mason, soon after the perpetuating statutes had made it dangerous to his lordship's civil and political privileges to continue a member of the reformed catholic church. Mr. Mason was succeeded by the rev. John Whelan, the father of the present writer. On the approach-removal of their clergyman, the catholic congregation at Woodhead addressed "the following artless account of their petition to the noble lord of the manor," the earl of Errol, on September the 4th :—

MY LORD,—The reverend John Gleig, present pastor of Scottish episcopal congregation at Woodhead, having accepted a call to the episcopal chapel at New Pitsligo, under the patronage of the respectable baronet sir William Forbes, proprietor of the village, thereby leaves his charge in this village vacant; hence do we for ourselves, and in behalf of the anient members of our congregation, presume to address your lordship in our present situation. The principle on which we adhere to the Scottish episcopal communion is, that we conceive it to be the duty of an episcopal congregation to be in submission to a bishop, and in communion with that bishop within whose bounds such congregation is situated. This is a principle which we hold to be the bond of christian unity, recognised by primitive practice and universal usage, in which, moreover, we agree with the venerable bishops and other respectable dignitaries of the church of England at this day; nor do we perceive, besides this, any essential difference betwixt us and the other episcopal congregation in which the rev. Mr. Stephen officiates as pastor.

THE UNBLEMISHED manners and clergyman-like behaviour of the last-mentioned gentleman obtain the esteem of all who know him; and on our principles, candidly stated above, we would willingly unite ourselves to him as our pastor, and render him all dutiful respect, submission, and support. And

¹ Annals, 285.

CHAPTER LXXVII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. JOHN SKINNER,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1800.—Address to the throne.—1801.—St. James's Cruden.—Letter to the earl of Errol—his reply.—Rev. J. Stephen's letter.—Bishop Skinner's address.—1802.—Address on the peace of Amiens.—Diocesan synod of Aberdeen.—Proposal for union.—Bishop Skinner's opinion.—Circular letter.—1803.—An address to the laity on the war, and to the king.—Principal Campbell's lectures—answered.—Bishop Skinner's work, *Primitive Truth and Order*, recommended.—Two clergymen and their congregations join the church.—1804.—A movement in Edinburgh towards union.—Diocesan synod in Aberdeen.—A convocation.—Rev. Dr. Sandford.—Laurencekirk.—Bishop Drummond resigns the see of Edinburgh.—Bishop Jolly's address.—Mr. Skinner's speech.—Preamble to the subscription of the XXXIX articles.—The articles subscribed.—Communion office.—Cause of the late schism stated.—The nature of schism—and its danger.

1800.—THE NINETEENTH century opened with brighter prospects to the church than she had experienced since the Revolution. A man of tried abilities, of ardent piety, and indefatigable in business, was providentially at her head, with the firm determination to gather her scattered and disjointed members into her communion. The only transaction that has been recorded in this year is an address to the throne by the bishops and clergy of the catholic church of Scotland, in consequence of the attempt of one Hatfield, a lunatic, who fired a pistol at the king, on the 15th of May, in Drury Lane Theatre. Addresses of congratulation were transmitted from all parts of the empire, and the primus and his colleagues were among the first to testify their unshaken loyalty, and their firm determination “to persevere in impressing on the minds of those who adhere to their ministry, a just sense of what they in duty owe to the prince whom God has set over them, and in gratitude to one of the best sovereigns whom

ng of kings has vouchsafed to a highly favoured
1."

.—A VERY SIMPLE circumstance was productive of considerable effect. Sir William Forbes, Bart. of Pitsligo, this presented the rev. John Gleig, who was priest at Woodhead, the parish of Cruden and diocese of Aberdeen, to his residence in the village of Pitsligo, in the same diocese. In the parish of Cruden, the earl of Errol had built St. James's independent chapel, to which he appointed his own chaplain, a Scottish gentleman, the rev. John Mason, soon after the passing of the statutes had made it dangerous to his lordship's civil and political privileges to continue a member of the reformed church. Mr. Mason was succeeded by the rev. John Gleig, the father of the present writer. On the approach of the removal of their clergyman, the catholic congregation at Woodhead addressed "the following artless account of their petition to the noble lord of the manor," the earl of Errol, September the 4th :—

MY LORD,—The reverend John Gleig, present pastor of the Scottish episcopal congregation at Woodhead, having accepted a call to the episcopal chapel at New Pitsligo, under the patronage of the respectable baronet sir William Forbes, proprietor of the village, thereby leaves his charge in this vacant; hence do we for ourselves, and in behalf of the present members of our congregation, presume to address your lordship in our present situation. The principle on which we adhere to the Scottish episcopal communion is, that we receive it to be the duty of an episcopal congregation to submit to a bishop, and in communion with that bishop within whose bounds such congregation is situated.

This is a principle which we hold to be the bond of an unity, recognised by primitive practice and universal in which, moreover, we agree with the venerable bishops and other respectable dignitaries of the church of England at this day; nor do we perceive, besides this, any essential difference betwixt us and the other episcopal congregation in which the rev. Mr. Stephen officiates as pastor.

THE UNBLEMISHED manners and clergyman-like behaviour of the last-mentioned gentleman obtain the esteem of all who know him; and on our principles, candidly stated above, we should willingly unite ourselves to him as our pastor, and pay him all dutiful respect, submission, and support. And

such compliance on his part is not without a precedent; a respectable congregation in the town of Banff, having, some years ago, united themselves to the Scottish episcopal church, with the sanction and under the patronage of the earl of Fife, lord-lieutenant of the county of Banff, and other respectable gentlemen. The respect which we entertain for your lordship, and the connection that has subsisted between many of us and your lordship's noble ancestors, and which still subsists between your lordship and ourselves, has induced us to make this address to you. It would give us pleasure to worship, without the sacrifice of principle, in that assembly of which your lordship is so illustrious a member. We have only to entreat from your lordship's goodness, that whatever the result of this application may be, your lordship will believe us when we assure you it proceeds from the purest motives, and from our desire to promote love and concord among people living in our neighbourhood, and comely order and unity in the church of God.—Signed by the managers and vestrymen, eight in number¹."

THIS ADDRESS, which shews how well the simple peasants and fishermen who adhered to the true church had been taught, met with the kindest reception from lord Errol; and in his reply he assured them, "that if it met with the approbation of Mr. Stephen, and of those clerical friends in England whom he thought it his duty to consult, he should be most happy in acceding to their wishes, as the best thing that could be done by both congregations." What Mr. Stephen's opinion was, we learn from his address to his own congregation, in which he says, he "had long before made up his mind on the lawfulness and expediency" of this union. His lordship wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury on the subject, who not only advised, but required, his lordship to unite the two congregations without loss of time. In his address to the congregation of St. James's, on the 6th of December, being the Sunday before the union was effected, Mr. Stephen drew a vivid picture of the evils which the independent scheme had introduced into that parish, and from it we may judge of the state of other places all over the kingdom. "The direful consequences, it is apprehended, must still be fresh in every one's memory. Division and animosity, strife and hatred, envy and ill will, and every other malignant passion which it is the business of religion to suppress, were en-

¹ Annals, 294-296.

ruined by it, and prevailed but too generally among all ranks and degrees. The members of the same family were often divided, the parents against the children, and the children against the parents; brother against brother, and sister against sister; and, if any thing could be worse, the husband was incensed against his wife, and the wife against her husband. The peace and friendly intercourse of society were for a while suspended, and christian charity seemed to have forsaken the members of this once happy and flourishing congregation. . . . There was, however, but one method by which it [the restoration of peace] could be effected; and happily that method was both lawful in itself and approved by the purest reason;—the method I mean is the uniting into one communion with the episcopal church of Scotland¹.”

ST. JAMES'S CHAPEL being the larger and more commodious of the two, Mr. Gleig's congregation were removed to it on Sunday, the 13th December. The former ceased to be independent, and was received into the communion of the Scottish branch of the holy catholic church; but the English communion service was still retained². In a printed address to Mr. Gleig's congregation, the bishop of Aberdeen says—Nothing, you know, can be more proper, than that people who embrace the same principles of religion, founded on the truth as is in Christ, should also be distinguished by every outward mark that may be expressive of such unanimity of sentiment. It has, therefore, been long a matter of sincere regret, as well as of just surprise, that those who profess to be of the episcopal persuasion in this part of the kingdom were not united; they ought to be in one society or body, holding the profession of their faith in the unity of spirit and in the bond of peace. In order to bring about such a desirable event, and thereby to promote as far as they can the interest of true religion, the ritual governors of the Scottish episcopal church have for some time past been holding out proposals for effecting such a salutary union as must be highly agreeable to all the friends of pure and primitive episcopacy. To these proposals, offered on our part with the utmost sincerity of intention, I am happy to say that a pious and becoming regard has been shewn by the clergyman in your parish, who deriving his jurisdiction immediately from the church of England³, has

MS. Address.

The Rev. Alexander Cay, who succeeded in 1807 to this charge, happily introduced the Scottish communion office, and it has been used in that church ever since.

The Rev. John Stephen was ordained deacon on the 21st of September, 1783,

some years raised to *nine*. I find also the name of Mr. Gibb, of Turriff, and, after his death, of his widow, with *ten crowns* assigned. In the same list I find the names of GEORGE GLEIS and ALEXANDER JOLLY, with grants equally limited, because the claims were numerous and *urgent*. The two names which I have thus united, born in the same town, educated at the same school, and, though in different colleges, in what may be deemed the same university, would reflect credit on the most splendid church establishment. Yet did they each take his lot in a church so poorly endowed as to render the scanty aids which I have mentioned important and necessary, at least for a time. They made their election freely, and amidst all the difficulties and privations in the first period of their ministry, they felt no regret. Their attachment continued steadily increasing with their years and experience¹."

1795.—THE BISHOPS and clergy transmitted an address to the throne, in consequence of the king having been attacked, in his way to open parliament on the 29th of October, by a tumultuous and lawless mob. The address very justly ascribed that insult as flowing from the seditious associations and treasonable publications which then abounded; and in the accompanying letter, the primus assured Mr Dundas of his own, his colleagues', and the clergy's earnest desire, "to promote, as far as lies in their power, the salutary intention of those wise and prudent measures which government is adopting for the better preservation of his majesty's person and authority, and thereby securing more and more the happiness of the kingdom²."

1796.—THE BISHOP of Ross, Argyle, and Moray, represented to his colleagues the necessity, and strenuously urged the expediency, of appointing a coadjutor to him in his widely extended charge; not so much on account of the numerous congregations, for there were only nine in all the three dioceses, as the immense distances at which they were situate. Bishop Macfarlane proposed Mr. Jolly, incumbent of the chapel at Frasersburgh, to the priests of the diocese of Moray, who duly elected him as a fit person to fill the office of coadjutor-bishop for their diocesan. The primus, however, looking not to the man, but to the *propriety* of the measure at that particular time, and in the existing condition of the church, opposed and protested against Mr. Jolly's consecration. "If any thing were needed to show how steadily that venerable man

¹ Life of Bishop Jolly, prefixed to his Sunday Services, p. 8, 9.

² Annals, 283.

[bishop Skinner], in every part of his administration as primus, looked with a single eye to the good of the church, it could be in this very opposition of his to the elevation of one whom the common voice pronounced worthy of the episcopate." The primus's protest and opposition arose not "from any objection to the man, whom he ever highly and heartily esteemed," but "on the special ground that it was unnecessary in the then circumstances of the church." Bishop Skinner's objections were overruled by his colleagues; nevertheless they were invincible, and time shewed the justice of them. "To the learning, the piety, and the strictly clerical deportment of the coadjutor elect, he bore ample testimony; but as the succession was then sufficiently strong, and as, in his view of things, additional *clergymen* were more wanted in the highlands of Scotland than the aid of an additional and non-resident bishop, who, though in most respects eminently qualified for the office, was confessedly ignorant of the Gaelic language, the primus refused to sanction the choice of the clergy of Ross and Moray, or to give his concurrence to the present promotion of a coadjutor to bishop Macfarlane¹." The other bishops, however, esteemed Mr. Jolly's primitive manners and theological acquirements sufficient to counterbalance the primus's special objections. And the majority, therefore, acting under the authority of the second section of the canons of 1743², assembled in synod in Dundee, on the eve of St. John the Baptist's Day, and there chose the bishop of Edinburgh their primus *pro hac vice*. On the following day, the 24th of June, being the feast of St. John the Baptist, Mr. Jolly was consecrated, without regard to the absence and protest of the primus, by bishop Abernethy Drummond, a temporary primus, assisted by bishops Macfarlane and Macdhan³. A priest informed the writer of this that he slept the same room with bishop Jolly the night previous to his consecration; and that when that venerable man thought my informant was asleep, he rose soon after midnight, dressed himself, and continued on his knees in prayer till morning.

1797-98.—MEN, SAYS the author of the Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, "like bishop Skinner, whose opposition to the measures of brethren in office originate in a sense of duty, without any selfish or sinister objects, cherish no resentments. To his colleagues individually, as well as collectively, the

Annals, 283.

² Vide *ante*, vol. iv. ch. lxix. p. 295.

Keith's Cat. App. 543. — Bishop Walker's Life of Jolly. — Mr. Cheyne's Memoirs. — Annals, 284. — Perceval, 255. — Private Letter.

some years raised to *nine*. I find also the name of Mr. Gibb, of Turriff, and, after his death, of his widow, with *ten crowns* assigned. In the same list I find the names of GEORGE GLEIG and ALEXANDER JOLLY, with grants equally limited, because the claims were numerous and *urgent*. The two names which I have thus united, born in the same town, educated at the same school, and, though in different colleges, in what may be deemed the same university, would reflect credit on the most splendid church establishment. Yet did they each take his lot in a church so poorly endowed as to render the scanty aids which I have mentioned important and necessary, at least for a time. They made their election freely, and amidst all the difficulties and privations in the first period of their ministry, they felt no regret. Their attachment continued steadily increasing with their years and experience¹."

1795.—THE BISHOPS and clergy transmitted an address to the throne, in consequence of the king having been attacked, in his way to open parliament on the 29th of October, by a tumultuous and lawless mob. The address very justly ascribed that insult as flowing from the seditious associations and treasonable publications which then abounded; and in the accompanying letter, the primus assured Mr Dundas of his own, his colleagues', and the clergy's earnest desire, "to promote, as far as lies in their power, the salutary intention of those wise and prudent measures which government is adopting for the better preservation of his majesty's person and authority, and thereby securing more and more the happiness of the kingdom²."

1796.—THE BISHOP of Ross, Argyle, and Moray, represented to his colleagues the necessity, and strenuously urged the expediency, of appointing a coadjutor to him in his widely extended charge; not so much on account of the numerous congregations, for there were only nine in all the three dioceses, as the immense distances at which they were situate. Bishop Macfarlane proposed Mr. Jolly, incumbent of the chapel at Frasersburgh, to the priests of the diocese of Moray, who duly elected him as a fit person to fill the office of coadjutor-bishop for their diocesan. The primus, however, looking not to the man, but to the *propriety* of the measure at that particular time, and in the existing condition of the church, opposed and protested against Mr. Jolly's consecration. "If any thing were needed to show how steadily that venerable man

¹ Life of Bishop Jolly, prefixed to his Sunday Services, p. 8, 9.

² Annals, 283.

bishop Skinner], in every part of his administration as primus, looked with a single eye to the good of the church, it could be in this very opposition of his to the elevation of one whom the common voice pronounced worthy of the episcopate." The primus's protest and opposition arose not "from any objection to the man, whom he ever highly and heartily esteemed," but "on the special ground that it was unnecessary in the then circumstances of the church." Bishop Skinner's objections were overruled by his colleagues; nevertheless they were invincible, and time shewed the justice of them. "To the learning, the piety, and the strictly clerical deportment of the coadjutor elect, he bore ample testimony; but as the succession was then sufficiently strong, and as, in this view of things, additional *clergymen* were more wanted in the highlands of Scotland than the aid of an additional and non-resident bishop, who, though in most respects eminently qualified for the office, was confessedly ignorant of the Gaelic language, the primus refused to sanction the choice of the clergy of Ross and Moray, or to give his concurrence to the present promotion of a coadjutor to bishop Macfarlane¹." The other bishops, however, esteemed Mr. Jolly's primitive manners and theological acquirements sufficient to counterbalance the primus's special objections. And the majority, therefore, acting under the authority of the second section of the canons of 1743², assembled in synod in Dundee, on the eve of St. John the Baptist's Day, and there chose the bishop of Edinburgh their primus *pro hac vice*. On the following day, the 24th of June, being the feast of St. John the Baptist, Mr. Jolly was consecrated, without regard to the absence and protest of the primus, by bishop Abernethy Drummond, the temporary primus, assisted by bishops Macfarlane and Erskine³. A priest informed the writer of this that he slept in the same room with bishop Jolly the night previous to his consecration; and that when that venerable man thought my informant was asleep, he rose soon after midnight, dressed himself, and continued on his knees in prayer till morning.

1797-98.—MEN, says the author of the *Annals of Scottish Episcopacy*, "like bishop Skinner, whose opposition to the measures of brethren in office originate in a sense of duty, without any selfish or sinister objects, cherish no resentments. To his colleagues individually, as well as collectively, the

¹ *Annals*, 283.

² *Vide ante*, vol. iv. ch. lxix. p. 295.

³ *Keith's Cat.* App. 543. — *Bishop Walker's Life of Jolly*. — *Mr. Cheyne's Memoirs*. — *Annals*, 284. — *Perceval*, 255. — *Private Letter*.

right hand of fellowship was speedily extended; and as no man experienced, through bishop Skinner's life, more of his brotherly regard than the bishop of Moray, so did no man more cordially lament the loss sustained by himself, and the church at large, in the primus's sudden demise, than that venerable prelate¹." Bishop Jolly continued coadjutor to bishop Macfarlane till February 1798, but he had never officiated as bishop in the diocese; a circumstance which shews the propriety of bishop Skinner's objections to his elevation to the episcopate, at the particular time when he was consecrated. Bishop Walker cites an "N. B." from the Register of the Episcopal College, which states, that "in consequence of bishop Macfarlane's resignation, bishop Jolly was unanimously elected to Moray, February 14th, 1798, and regularly collated to that charge, on the 22d of the said month, by the primus and all his colleagues." The ancient diocese of Moray was then disjoined from that of Ross, to which, since bishop Dunbar's resignation, it had been united. At that time there were but four congregations in the whole bishoprick, viz. Elgin and Duffus, both served by one priest, Huntly, and Keith².

THE COMMISSION OF THE General Assembly of the kirk issued a most excellent and well-digested "warning and admonition to the people of Scotland," upon the extraordinary state of public affairs; and the ministers were directed to read it from their respective pulpits on Thursday, the 8th of March, 1798, being the day appointed for a national fast, or on the first Lord's day after it came to their hands. One of the paragraphs contains the following—"In the arduous contest in which we are at present engaged, we have not as yet met with any national disaster; but whilst the other states of Europe, intimidated by the progress of the French arms, are bending under the yoke, we have hitherto been able to protect our commerce, and to ward off the hostilities which have been directed against our shores. While, brethren, you celebrate the gallantry of our seamen, the vigilance and activity of our naval administration, the skill and alertness of our commanders; while you honour with daily expressions of your good will the illustrious heroes who led to victory, and pay every tribute to the memory of the brave and faithful men who fell in the cause of their country;—amidst the acknowledgments due to human exertions, look up to Him whom the winds and the sea

¹ Annals, 284.

² Bishop Walker's Life of Bishop Jolly, 12, 13.—Annals, 284.

y. Recollect the circumstances which render the time and measure of a naval victory completely dependent on the will of heaven. In the train of success which has attended around the globe, mark the continued interposition of Providence for our defence ; and after the examples of the noble admirals, who, in the presence of their sovereign, presented on the altars of God the colours which have been won in great naval engagements of this war, let all ranks of men unite in saying, ‘ Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name be the glory ¹.’ ”

1799.—THAT ECCENTRIC and schismatical personage, Rowland Hill, had preached in several of the established kirks, and moreover, threatened another visit for a similar purpose. To prevent his intrusion, and that of Mr. Simeon of Cambridge, and others, who were not qualified to preach in the established kirks, the Assembly passed a very necessary Declaratory Act respecting unqualified ministers and preachers, in which such wandering stars are very properly most peremptorily prohibited from preaching in any of the kirks or chapels of ease. The Assembly “ do hereby discharge and prohibit, under pain of such censures as the judicatories of this church may see fit to inflict, all the ministers of this church, and the ministers of all chapels of ease connected therewith, from employing to preach upon any occasion, or to dispense any of the ordinances of the gospel, within any congregation under the jurisdiction of this church, persons who are not qualified, according to the laws of this church, to accept of a presentation, and from holding ministerial communion in any other manner with such persons. And the General Assembly do hereby enjoin all presbyteries of this church to attend to any transgression of this prohibition which may occur within their bounds, and to summon the minister who is reported as being guilty of such transgression, to answer for his conduct ². ” This rigorous act has incurred the wrath of Hetherington, who “ By this act, such men as Rowland Hill, and Simeon of Cambridge, were expressly aimed at, and excluded from the pulpit in the established church of Scotland, not because they were episcopalians, but because their doctrine was evangelical ; for the act was moved, carried, and enforced by the moderate party, contrary to the feelings and wishes of their religious opponents ³. ”

THESE WERE a littleness of mind and a meanness of character

¹ Acts of Assembly, Appendix, p. 1158.

² Ibid, 869.

³ Hetherington's History, 229.

displayed by lord chancellor Thurlow in his opposition to the relief bill for the Scottish church, arising from pique, because the deputation had not shewn him that personal deference to which he was entitled. He opposed its progress as long as he possibly could ; and when from the general unanimity of parliament it was forced forward in spite of his opposition, he then “fixed his foot” at the Oath of Abjuration,—an oath that many conscientiously scruple to take, not from any disloyalty to the present sovereign, but because it asserts that which is doubtful at least, if not untrue. It asserts William prince of Orange’s *right* to the throne ; and requires a solemn and sincere declaration of conscientious belief that the prince of Wales was not the son of James II., but a supposititious child, and of course that he had no rightful pretensions to the throne of his father. William was James’s nephew, it is true, but so long as the king’s son and three daughters survived, he could not be rightfully by hereditary descent the heir to the crown ; and, therefore, to swear that he was so, even at this day, must operate against the conscience. But it is still more distressing to swear to the disbelief of a matter of fact attested by all the officers of state, upon a falsehood propagated by bishop Burnet for the purpose of serving the interest of his patron, the prince of Orange. At the Revolution, the fathers of the Scottish church utterly denied this principle, and were deprived of their temporal station and revenues ; their successors maintained the same principles, and for which they suffered persecution. Yet the spitefulness of lord Thurlow entailed this oath upon the church as the price of relief from persecution, and of the restoration of their civil rights and privileges as loyal subjects. The Oath of Abjuration might surely now be laid aside, as, whatever fears there might formerly have been of the rightful heir to the crown’s restoration, there can now be no necessity for abjuring rights that have long since sunk into the silent tomb. It is, therefore, to be hoped that the wisdom of parliament will relieve all parties from an oath that has become obsolete, and even absurd and wicked ; for the wording of it implies the existence of a pretender to the crown, whereas Victoria is in the undisputed possession, and without any rival claimant.

AMIDST THE general decay of religion, and the prevalence of unfaithfulness, which characterised the conclusion of the eighteenth century, the children of the household of faith “had light in their dwellings.” The indwelling presence of God with His church does not depend upon the multitude of its adherents, their rank in society, or on the abundance of their wealth ; the poor widow and her mite being an illustration of

his position. The great and the wealthy had for the most part deserted their mother in her distress, and none of the sons whom she had reared took her by the hand in the hour of her greatest suffering, that they might not lose their civil and political rights, of which they would have been deprived had they worshipped with the ministers of the desolate and persecuted church of their fathers. They felt no pity at seeing her in the dust, nor of seeing the fire of presbytery and of independency "consuming" or enticing away her young men, her priests slain with the sword of poverty, whilst there were no widows to make lamentation. "So the Lord awaked, as one out of sleep, and like a giant refreshed with wine." To all human appearance the church seemed to have been utterly "extirpated," root and branch; and each zealous priest might almost have said with the prophet of old, "The children of the kingdom have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down Thine altars," set up schismatical independency against them, and thy prophets have been slain with the sword of poverty; "and I, even I only, am left." Yet there were still seven thousand left who had not bowed their knees to presbytery, nor kissed independency. And at this time of its lowest depression He raised up a man to govern and feed his church with a faithful and true heart; and gave him a heart to conceive, and a hand to effect, not only the release of the church from oppression and bondage, but also the restoration of those who had separated from her in the hour of her distress. Whilst the church was struggling with external evils, she maintained the catholic doctrine of the holy eucharist, and thus had the light of truth in her dwellings; whilst those by whom she was surrounded fell into the darkness of Socinianism, and denied the Lord that bought them. This might be easily predicated, from the antinomian nature of the Westminster Confession of Faith; but we have it confessed by their own historian. He says, "during above ten years, the west country was fiercely agitated with polemical controversy between these Socinians and their sounder brethren. The Socinian party were termed *New Light* men, and their opponents were called the defenders of the *Old Light*. In this controversy, as was to be expected, every person of irreligious or immoral character espoused the cause of the *New Light*, or Socinian party¹." Doubting and disputing against the Word of God is unbelief proceeding from the heart and affections, for "all men have not faith," and consequently do not obey the will of God; *faith* and *obedience* being convertible terms.

¹ Hetherington's History, p. 226.

CHAPTER LXXVII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. JOHN SKINNER,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1800.—Address to the throne.—1801.—St. James's Cruden.—Letter to the earl of Errol—his reply.—Rev. J. Stephen's letter.—Bishop Skinner's address.—1802.—Address on the peace of Amiens.—Diocesan synod of Aberdeen.—Proposal for union.—Bishop Skinner's opinion.—Circular letter.—1803.—An address to the laity on the war, and to the king.—Principal Campbell's lectures—answered.—Bishop Skinner's work, *Primitive Truth and Order*, recommended.—Two clergymen and their congregations join the church.—1804.—A movement in Edinburgh towards union.—Diocesan synod in Aberdeen.—A convocation.—Rev. Dr. Sandford.—Laurenceckirk.—Bishop Drummond resigns the see of Edinburgh.—Bishop Jolly's address.—Mr. Skinner's speech.—Preamble to the subscription of the XXXIX articles.—The articles subscribed.—Communion office.—Cause of the late schism stated.—The nature of schism—and its danger.

1800.—THE NINETEENTH century opened with brighter prospects to the church than she had experienced since the Revolution. A man of tried abilities, of ardent piety, and indefatigable in business, was providentially at her head, with the firm determination to gather her scattered and disjointed members into her communion. The only transaction that has been recorded in this year is an address to the throne by the bishops and clergy of the catholic church of Scotland, in consequence of the attempt of one Hatfield, a lunatic, who fired a pistol at the king, on the 15th of May, in Drury Lane Theatre. Addresses of congratulation were transmitted from all parts of the empire, and the primus and his colleagues were among the first to testify their unshaken loyalty, and their firm determination “to persevere in impressing on the minds of those who adhere to their ministry, a just sense of what they in duty owe to the prince whom God has set over them, and in gratitude to one of the best sovereigns whom

King of kings has vouchsafed to a highly favoured people¹."

1801.—A VERY SIMPLE circumstance was productive of considerable effect. Sir William Forbes, Bart. of Pitsligo, this year presented the rev. John Gleig, who was priest at Woodhead, in the parish of Cruden and diocese of Aberdeen, to his seat in the village of Pitsligo, in the same diocese. In the parish of Cruden, the earl of Errol had built St. James's independent chapel, to which he appointed his own chaplain, an English gentleman, the rev. John Mason, soon after the perpetrating statutes had made it dangerous to his lordship's civil and political privileges to continue a member of the reformed catholic church. Mr. Mason was succeeded by the rev. John Glen, the father of the present writer. On the approach and removal of their clergyman, the catholic congregation at Woodhead addressed "the following artless account of their situation to the noble lord of the manor," the earl of Errol, on the 4th of September the 4th:—

MY LORD,—The reverend John Gleig, present pastor of the Scottish episcopal congregation at Woodhead, having accepted a call to the episcopal chapel at New Pitsligo, under the patronage of the respectable baronet sir William Forbes, proprietor of the village, thereby leaves his charge in this village vacant; hence do we for ourselves, and in behalf of the present members of our congregation, presume to address your lordship in our present situation. The principle on which we adhere to the Scottish episcopal communion is, that we conceive it to be the duty of an episcopal congregation to be in submission to a bishop, and in communion with that bishop within whose bounds such congregation is situated. This is a principle which we hold to be the bond of christian unity, recognised by primitive practice and universal usage, in which, moreover, we agree with the venerable bishops and other respectable dignitaries of the church of England at this day; nor do we perceive, besides this, any essential difference betwixt us and the other episcopal congregation in which the rev. Mr. Stephen officiates as pastor.

THE UNBLEMISHED manners and clergyman-like behaviour of the last-mentioned gentleman obtain the esteem of all who know him; and on our principles, candidly stated above, we could willingly unite ourselves to him as our pastor, and render him all dutiful respect, submission, and support. And

¹ Annals, 285.

such compliance on his part is not without a precedent; a respectable congregation in the town of Banff, having, some years ago, united themselves to the Scottish episcopal church, with the sanction and under the patronage of the earl of Fife, lord-lieutenant of the county of Banff, and other respectable gentlemen. The respect which we entertain for your lordship, and the connection that has subsisted between many of us and your lordship's noble ancestors, and which still subsists between your lordship and ourselves, has induced us to make this address to you. It would give us pleasure to worship, without the sacrifice of principle, in that assembly of which your lordship is so illustrious a member. We have only to entreat from your lordship's goodness, that whatever the result of this application may be, your lordship will believe us when we assure you it proceeds from the purest motives, and from our desire to promote love and concord among people living in our neighbourhood, and comely order and unity in the church of God.—Signed by the managers and vestrymen, eight in number¹."

THIS ADDRESS, which shews how well the simple peasants and fishermen who adhered to the true church had been taught, met with the kindest reception from lord Errol; and in his reply he assured them, "that if it met with the approbation of Mr. Stephen, and of those clerical friends in England whom he thought it his duty to consult, he should be most happy in acceding to their wishes, as the best thing that could be done by both congregations." What Mr. Stephen's opinion was, we learn from his address to his own congregation, in which he says, he "had long before made up his mind on the lawfulness and expediency" of this union. His lordship wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury on the subject, who not only advised, but required, his lordship to unite the two congregations without loss of time. In his address to the congregation of St. James's, on the 6th of December, being the Sunday before the union was effected, Mr. Stephen drew a vivid picture of the evils which the independent scheme had introduced into that parish, and from it we may judge of the state of other places all over the kingdom. "The direful consequences, it is apprehended, must still be fresh in every one's memory. Division and animosity, strife and hatred, envy and ill will, and every other malignant passion which it is the business of religion to suppress, were en-

¹ Annals, 294-296.

endered by it, and prevailed but too generally among all ranks and degrees. The members of the same family were then divided, the parents against the children, and the children against the parents; brother against brother, and sister against sister; and, if any thing could be worse, the husband was incensed against his wife, and the wife against her husband. The peace and friendly intercourse of society were for a while suspended, and christian charity seemed to have forsaken the members of this once happy and flourishing congregation. . . . There was, however, but one method by which it [the restoration of peace] could be effected; and happily that method was both lawful in itself and approved by the purest reason;—the method I mean is the uniting into one communion with the episcopal church of Scotland¹.”

ST. JAMES'S CHAPEL being the larger and more commodious of the two, Mr. Gleig's congregation were removed to it on Sunday, the 13th December. The former ceased to be independent, and was received into the communion of the Scottish branch of the holy catholic church; but the English communion service was still retained². In a printed address to Mr. Gleig's congregation, the bishop of Aberdeen says—Nothing, you know, can be more proper, than that people who embrace the same principles of religion, founded on the truth as is in Christ, should also be distinguished by every outward mark that may be expressive of such unanimity of sentiment. It has, therefore, been long a matter of sincere regret, as well as of just surprise, that those who profess to be of the episcopal persuasion in this part of the kingdom were not united; they ought to be in one society or body, holding the profession of their faith in the unity of spirit and in the bond of peace. In order to bring about such a desirable event, and thereby to promote as far as they can the interest of true religion, the spiritual governors of the Scottish episcopal church have for some time past been holding out proposals for effecting such a salutary union as must be highly agreeable to all the true friends of pure and primitive episcopacy. To these proposals, offered on our part with the utmost sincerity of intention, I am happy to say that a pious and becoming regard has been shewn by the clergyman in your parish, who deriving his jurisdiction immediately from the church of England³, has

MS. Address.

¹ The Rev. Alexander Cay, who succeeded in 1807 to this charge, happily introduced the Scottish communion office, and it has been used in that church ever since.

² The Rev. John Stephen was ordained deacon on the 21st of September, 1783,

nnited himself, in the most solemn manner, to what may be justly called, though in an humble and lowly form, her sister church in Scotland. Having thus shewn an example highly creditable to himself, and worthy of being imitated by all his brethren in this country, it is no less incumbent upon me, whom he has acknowledged as his ecclesiastical superior, to support, countenance, and encourage, as far as lies in my power, the laudable step he has taken, and the motives which have given rise to it. I do, therefore, most gladly embrace this opportunity of informing you, that the Reverend Mr. Stephen, the clergyman to whom I allude, is now to be considered as a regular presbyter of our church. And being so conveniently situated for acting as your minister, now that Mr. Gleig is about to resign his charge of you, I do most readily, and, I hope, with your own entire consent and approbation, commit you to the said Mr. Stephen's pastoral care and attention, not doubting but that he and you will experience that mutual comfort and satisfaction in each other which it is my fervent wish and prayer you may long and happily enjoy¹."

1802.—A HAPPY COMMENCEMENT was now made for the return of the schismatical wanderers to the household of faith, from which they had been originally driven by the severity of the persecuting statutes of 1748, which were designed to have fulfilled the oath of the covenant to *extirpate* the church. Perhaps I may be pardoned for having dwelt so long on this particular case, from my affectionate remembrance of one of the parties, and because I have documents in my possession which have not been noticed by Mr. Skinner, in his Annals. The only transaction which he records in this year was an address to the king on the conclusion of the hollow and short peace of Amiens, which was graciously received, and a suitable answer returned.

THE ANNUAL synodical meeting of the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen took place on the 18th of August, in the primus's dwelling-house. Bishop Skinner proposed to take into consideration the expediency of an union of all the independent congregations in Scotland; and "he expressed in the strongest terms his ardent desire to promote so desirable an object, and his willingness to remove, as far as lay in his power, every obstacle which could be discovered to stand in the way of it.

by John [Moore, D.D.] lord archbishop of Canterbury; and priest, by William [Markham, D.D.] lord archbishop of York, on Sunday, 16th of October, 1785. —Letters of Orders, in the author's possession.

¹ An Address to the Members of the Congregation of the Scotch Episcopal Church in Cruden, by Bishop Skinner, pp. 3 and 4.

He was anxious to know the disposition of the clergy and laity of the English communion, and to be informed of what objections they might have to the measure." Mr. Stephen, of Cruden, then said, that "he had conversed on the subject with all his brethren in this diocese except Mr. Alcock, and found that most of them not only approved of the measure, but were anxious that it should be carried into effect; that it was the opinion of some of them, that a mutual exchange of pulpits, or discharge of duties, though in itself irregular, and a readiness on the part of the Scotch episcopal clergy to lessen that distance and reserve which had hitherto been kept up between the two parties, by treating those of the English communion as friends and brethren when they met, would greatly facilitate such a step, and reconcile the minds of the laity to it by degrees. The bishop replied, that 'he was extremely happy to hear that so good a disposition prevailed among the English ordained clergy, and he hoped they would take pains to promote the same good disposition among their respective congregations. He thought, however, that in the present stage of the business, when only general expressions of good-will to the cause of union had been made by the English [ordained] clergy, and before any other steps had been taken towards its accomplishment, or any security given that such accomplishment would follow, the proposed exchange of pulpits was rather premature, and not likely to meet the ideas entertained by himself and his brethren on this subject.' Though he disapproved of this as a first or leading step, yet, if any overtures were made towards an union which he might think likely to ensure success, he would not object to any accommodating proposal which could with propriety be adopted. In the meantime, he earnestly recommended it to his own clergy to take every prudent method in their power to let his sentiments, and his earnest desire to promote an object of so much importance to the interests of true religion, be known to all concerned. He added, that 'he and the other bishops of Scotland had hitherto been kept back from addressing the English episcopal clergy in behalf of themselves and those of their communion, from motives of delicacy, as they were uncertain whether or not it would be acceptable, and how it might be done with the best effect.'"

THE SYNOD then recommended Mr. Stephen to write to all the English ordained clergy in the diocese of Aberdeen, five in number, to inform them of what had occurred in the synod, to lay before them the motives that had induced himself to enter into the communion of the church, and to enclose to each

a copy of the Articles of Union, that they might see on what reasonable terms such a desirable measure was proposed. He wrote a circular letter accordingly, and, after some preliminary observations, he proceeds to detail the considerations that influenced himself, and, among other things, he said, "I reflected that all those of the episcopal persuasion in this part of the United Kingdom were originally but *one church*, and would have ever continued to be one, had not a division been occasioned by the political state of the country; that our separation from this church proceeded from no doubts which were entertained of the episcopal character of her bishops, nor from any difference in religious principles, but only to what we, in conjunction with the great body of the nation, judged an error in politics; that the introduction of English ordained clergymen into this country was an expedient devised by the state, and, I have reason to say, reluctantly complied with by the church of England, for the accommodation of those congregations that were attached to the episcopal form of church government, and that wished to enjoy the manifold advantages of a liturgical worship without incurring the pains and penalties to which those were exposed who adhered to the old political system. I considered that this expedient could never have been intended but for a *temporary* purpose; and that when the cause that gave rise to it should cease (as happily it has ceased), the expedient itself, or at least the necessity of continuing it, ought to cease of course. I considered, likewise, that the church of England, as her bishops have *always disclaimed* every idea of jurisdiction in Scotland, and have refused to interfere in the affairs even of those clergymen whom they had themselves ordained, could have no intention, nor even a wish, to continue such an order of men any longer than the end required for which the measure was first adopted. For these reasons I was of opinion that our return to union with the episcopal church of Scotland, now that the original cause of separation is removed, must meet with the approbation of the English bishops. I was happy, therefore, to find that opinion confirmed not only by bishops Horne, Horsley, and Douglas, but by others also. And that the same must also be agreeable to the state, I thought might be concluded from this; that a complete toleration, the same in every respect but one, as we of the church of England have enjoyed, is now extended to the clergy of the Scotch episcopal church; and that in one clause at least of the act by which that toleration is granted, it seems to be supposed that we either *are*, or *may be*, connected with them, and under the jurisdiction of their bishops.

HE CONTINUES—"I next endeavoured to balance, in my own mind, the advantages and disadvantages which might be expected to result from the proposed union. In favour of union, considered in the abstract, the most cogent arguments presented themselves. But to pass over these, as they must be familiar to every man, I reflected that it is the humour of the present age for men to be 'led away with every wind of doctrine;' to 'heap to themselves teachers having itching ears,' and to split and divide the christian world into sects and parties, almost without number and without end. That all these have a natural tendency not only to disturb the peace of society, and to destroy christian charity, but also to bring religion itself into disrepute. . . . That Our Saviour plainly foresaw, and therefore prayed earnestly, that His true followers might be *one*, even as his Father and He were one,' that the world might believe that the Father had sent Him. From which it is evident that He considered *unity* among the members of His body as indispensably necessary to give the other arguments for the truth of His divine mission their full force. Under these circumstances I thought it was a duty incumbent on all men, but especially on the ministers of the gospel, everywhere within his own sphere, to counteract this growing evil, and to strengthen the cause of true religion, by establishing unity among the members of Christ's mystical body, wherever it could be done on sound and good principles. Happily the case in hand was one which I was fully persuaded fell within this description. Our brethren of the Scottish episcopal church were agreed with us in every thing essential to the christian religion; the original cause of our separation from them was happily removed; our return to communion with them was not only desired *by them*, but approved and recommended by our superiors in England; and nothing remained to prevent it, as far as I was able to judge, but a small difference in the form of administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (which you will see is provided for in the articles of union), and some degree of prejudice still remaining in the minds of some of our people, which it would be our duty to remove. Happily, in my case there was little of this kind to remove; for no sooner was the affair proposed to lord Errol, who, as patron, was chiefly concerned, than he conceived the advantages which must attend it in a religious point of view; and therefore, with a readiness and a zeal for the interests of religion which did honour to his understanding and his heart, he judged himself to give it all the weight of his influence. . . . His lordship, induced by the considerations [already men-

tioned], took a decided and active concern in the proposed union of the two congregations in this place, and warmly recommended it to me to take such steps as were necessary on my part towards its completion. And I must add, to the credit of the congregation, that, when the measure was proposed to them, it met with little opposition; on the contrary, the better informed part of them were anxious for its accomplishment."

HE THEN APPEALS to his brethren, as churchmen, to unite with the church, and shews them how decidedly the advantages are altogether on their side. He adds, the clergy of the reformed Catholic church "hold forth the most inviting terms to us their brethren, whose orders are derived from the church of England; and, with a liberality of mind which does them honour as men, as well as a degree of charity which must distinguish them as christians, they agree, in order to promote this desirable object, that we shall continue the use of the English liturgy in all its parts, the communion office being the only part in which there is any difference betwixt them and us. And our joining in communion with them requires nothing farther from us than, for the sake of unity and order, to pay canonical obedience to the bishop of the diocese in which we hold our charge. . . . Such is their [the bishops] desire of seeing a complete union established . . . that they are willing to do away, as far as possible, every existing difference, in order to promote so important an end. If, after this, we should refuse to co-operate with them in forwarding so good a work, we must allow that they are become superior to us in liberality of mind, as well as in their efforts to promote christian charity; a kind of superiority which we have never yet been willing to allow them¹."

1803.—WHEN THE WAR with France again broke out, the Primus and the other bishops issued an address to the laity of the church, on their duties, which was ordered to be read by every clergyman within their jurisdiction, "after divine service, in their several congregations, on the first Sunday after they shall have received the same." It is a document "alike creditable to the loyalty and sound discretion of the

¹ MS. letter in the author's possession, written at the desire of a synodical meeting of the bishop and clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen, held in the bishop's own house in Aberdeen, the 18th of August, 1802, to the following clergymen of the English communion within the diocese; viz. the Rev. Mr. Blake, St. James's chapel; Mr. Alcock and Mr. Deans, St. Paul's chapel, Aberdeen; Dr. Laing, St. Peter's chapel, Peterhead, and Mr. Allardyce, St. — chapel, Old Deer. By the Rev. John Stephen, of St. James's, Cruden.

the Primus of the Scottish episcopate," and it is "illustrative of the lively interest in the success of the war taken by bishop Skinner's fellow labourers in the ministry of the long-depressed episcopal church in Scotland." The address commenced with reminding the people of the great blessings, both spiritual and temporal, which they enjoyed under the British monarchy; and warned them against discontent, and of the necessity of submitting to many privations, in order to repel the gigantic force that was marshalled against their native country. "Those that belong to our communion we therefore earnestly exhort to show the same zeal and promptitude in the offer of such services as our sovereign may be pleased to accept, not doubting of their ardent desire to co-operate with their fellow-subjects in forwarding every measure which his majesty shall think proper to adopt for the defence of the country and the security of his people. . . . As the danger which now threatens the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is singular in its nature and magnitude, and far beyond any thing that has been experienced for many years past, so the means of repelling it are not to be measured by those of any former contest. They must be such as are suited to the present awful struggle; and when all is at stake that ought to be dearest to the heart of man, it is not easy to calculate the extent of every particular sacrifice which must be made for the general good¹."

AT THE SAME time the bishops forwarded a humble address, in their own and their clergy's names, to the king, professing the utmost loyalty to his person and government; and concludes—"That the high and mighty Being, who is 'King of kings, and Lord of lords, the only ruler,' and therefore the surest guard 'of princes,' may continue to take our beloved sovereign under his gracious care and protection; may so direct the councils, and strengthen the hands of government, as to enable your majesty to 'vanquish and overcome all your enemies;' as it is the voice of our public supplications to the throne of heaven, so shall it ever be the private unfeigned wish and prayer of, &c.—(Signed), John Skinner, *Primus*, William Abernethy Drummond, Jonathan Watson, Andrew Macfarlane, John Strachan, Alexander Jolly²."

SOME TIME in this year, Dr. Campbell's (principal of Marischal College) Lectures on Ecclesiastical History were published, after his death, by his executors, in which he asserted, that "the ordination of our present episcopal clergy is solely from presbyters; that the consecrations of bishop Rose were

¹ Annals, 300-310.

² Ibid. 311, 312.

farcical, that is, null and void; and that the bishops whom he consecrated “were solemnly made the depositories of no deposits, commanded to be diligent in doing no work, vigilant in the oversight of no flock, assiduous in teaching and governing no people, and that they presided in no church.” It was said that the principal had loaded a blunderbuss to be fired off by his executors, as he himself was afraid of the recoil. When this blunderbuss was examined with attention, “it was found that he even had never consulted any of the original authorities, but had relied entirely on lord King’s Inquiry, whose method and system he adopted, without having detected several notable errors of the press, which he very faithfully copies¹.” Bishop Skinner says,—“Had our professor’s theological lectures been confined to the chair from which they were delivered, and reached no farther than the circle of his pupils, we should not have been obliged to take any notice even of that part of them which was directly intended to oppose the principles and pretensions of what he calls the ‘Scotch episcopal party;’ because, as an established lecturer, he had a right to instruct his students, as he thought proper, in the peculiar tenets of his own and their profession. But when these instructions were committed to the press, and published to the world, for the *evident purpose* of impressing on the public mind not only a mean and unfavourable idea of the established form of church government, but a *thorough contempt* of what still remains of the ancient establishment of this country, we could not allow ourselves to be wholly silent on a subject with which our best and dearest interests are so intimately connected, nor suffer the episcopal church of Scotland to appear as without a friend in the day of her humiliation, complaining, as it were, in the words of the prophet, ‘that there was none to take her by the hand, of all the sons that she had brought up².’” Dr. Campbell’s lectures were also “very ably exposed, and his opinions on the episcopal controversy were learnedly and acutely reviewed by bishop Gleig, in six successive numbers of the *Anti-Jacobin Review*; by the late bishop Skinner, in his ‘*Primitive Truth and Order*,’ and by archdeacon Daubeney, in a ‘preliminary discourse to eight sermons on the connection between the Old and New Testament³.’” They were also very successfully attacked by bishop Abernethy Drummond, in a letter to the editor of the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, which he signs with his own name.

¹ Bishop Walker’s *Life of Bishop Jolly*, 22.

² *Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated*, 450, 451.

³ *Life of Bishop Jolly*, 23.

introductory chapter to *Primitive Truth and Order*, Skinner says,—“The design of this publication is to come arguments in defence of episcopacy in general, and especially that of Scotland; and to persuade such of the tenants of this country as profess to be of the episcopal union, to walk worthy of that profession, by acting in a manner consistent with it, and endeavouring to support the institution, and preserve the unity of that small remnant of the established church which still happily exists in this part of the united kingdom¹.”

SKINNER WISH that any recommendation of mine could be a general perusal of bishop Skinner's *Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated*, of which it was said by Dr. Hill, principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, and a presbyterian, it was the best defence of episcopacy in the English language, and *more* than a sufficient refutation of Dr. Campbell." The discharge of the principal's blunderbuss, however, was of great service to the church over which bishop Skinner presided. The answer was read, and it made a deep impression on the minds of those Independent clergymen who were keeping up a causeless schism, and two of them were this day added to the church. The Rev. Dr. Laing, the English Independent clergyman of St. Peter's chapel, Peterhead, signed the Articles of union on the 27th of June, and the Rev. Dr. Spens, of Stonehaven, signed them on the 15th of December. The latter gentleman having been ordained by a bishop of Durham, and considering his successors in that see his spiritual advisers, consulted the then bishop of Durham, Dr. Barrington, who told him that the principles of the two churches were the same, and there being now no legal obstacles in the way, he ought to conform².

4.—A MOVEMENT towards a return to the church had commenced in Edinburgh among the laity, which eventually led to union in that city, and paved the way for it in other places. A zealous layman, but whose name is unfortunately not given, addressed a letter to Dr. Spens, of Edinburgh, who transmitted it to the Primus, respecting the junction of the principal Independent chapel in that city. The object of the letter was to shew the propriety of the clergy of the Independent churches agreeing to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, as it had been provided for in the act of parliament. He says, the object of those who hesitate to return to the church could not be founded on the non-conformity of the members of the

¹ *Primitive Truth*, &c. 7.

² *Annals*, 323.

church respecting the oath of abjuration. But, says he, "there is another point of nonconformity, however, which to the legislature is civil, but as to English priests is also spiritual—I mean the Thirty-nine Articles, which the Act of 1706 requires to be assented to by the Scottish episcopal churchmen, in order to give them the benefits of toleration. For want of this, it is thought by some that the Scottish episcopal church is exceptionable; first, as having no confessional; and, secondly, as not acknowledging the king's supremacy, as thereby declared in the 37th Article. . . . If the Scotch bishops were to adopt these Articles, with the trifling variations for Scotland, instead of England, as belonging to their church, to sign them as such, and to require the signature of them at ordinations, I do think it would materially affect some opinions worthy of attention¹."

THE PRIMUS adopted this hint, and at his diocesan synod in August he submitted the proposal to his own clergy of holding a convocation of the whole church, for the purpose of considering the design of subscription, as suggested above. They cordially acquiesced, and earnestly requested the bishop forthwith to submit the matter "to the serious and solemn consideration of the whole church." The other bishops being also agreeable to subscription, and concurring in the wishes of the Primus, a circular was issued on the 11th of September, summoning the clergy to meet in the chapel of the village of Laurencekirk on Wednesday, the 24th October, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, "to exhibit, in the most solemn manner, a testimony of our conformity in doctrine and discipline with the church of England, and thereby to remove every remaining obstacle to the union of the episcopalians in Scotland." The Primus transmitted a copy of his summons to the REV. DR. SANDFORD, an English clergyman, who then officiated in a hall in West Register Street, which was afterwards occupied by Mr. John Moir as a printing-office. As an individual, Dr. Sandford stated, in reply to the Primus, that if "this testimony of your agreement with the church of England be given in the solemn way which you propose, and our Thirty-nine Articles be thus made the permanent confessional of the Scotch episcopal church, there can be *no objection* to our union." The Primus at one time intended to have proposed the adoption of a preamble, disclaiming "the absurd Calvinistic sense" which some of its subscribers had forced upon the XVII. Article, but he was induced to abandon this intention at the suggestion

¹ Annals, 329-332.

of sir William Forbes. After having stated his objections to the intended preamble, sir William says,—“ Perhaps, therefore, it will be best that the Articles be subscribed agreeably to the Act 1792, as they stand in the service-book of the church of England, and prefaced as they are there with the royal declaration; every subscriber explaining them to himself according to what seems most consonant to the Word of God, and according to the practice in England¹. ”

THE CONVOCATION met in the chapel of Laurencekirk on the 24th of October, and there were present bishop Skinner, of Aberdeen, the Primus; bishop Macfarlane, of Ross and Argyle; bishop Watson, of Dunkeld, and bishop Jolly, of Moray; also thirty-eight priests, and two deacons. Bishop Abernethy Drummond, of Glasgow, and bishop Strachan, of Brechin, were prevented by old age and infirmity from attending. In anticipation of the junction of the clergy in Edinburgh, Dr. Abernethy Drummond resigned that see, that some one of the English conforming clergy might be promoted to it. Prayers were read by the bishop of Dunkeld, and the Primus delivered a discourse, which is now before me, on the subject of the Articles, in which he made a brief, but most excellent, commentary upon each. “ If,” he says, “ those Articles of religion are to be considered as a form of this kind [whereby we may declare our agreement in doctrine and discipline with the united church of England and Ireland], and such I think is the light in which we may justly behold them, we cannot, then, do better than join with the church of England, in adopting them as the standard of our christian doctrine, and thus supply a want which we have long lamented, by making them the public and permanent confessional of our church². ”

ON THE DISMISSAL of the lay members of the congregation, bishop Skinner solemnly pronounced the meeting “ A CONVOCATION OF THE BISHOPS AND CLERGY OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND. ” The bishops severally delivered their opinions, and bishop Jolly read a long and excellent address; in the conclusion of which, he said,—“ The learned Mr. Daubeny agrees with those who acknowledge that some of the Articles ‘ might have been better expressed; ’ and that ‘ though an admirable, yet they are an improvable form of sound words. ’ Much more might we in Scotland claim our right of expressing that true sense of them [anti-Calvinistic] which he and other worthy churchmen have so fully evinced in words

¹ Annals, 334-341.

² Sermon, 2 Tim. i. 13, p. 29.

less liable to be misunderstood. But instead of a new form, *we adopt and embrace theirs*, out of our love and desire of unity and concord; that, being of one heart and mind in our one Lord Jesus Christ, we may, as with one mouth, all speak the same thing, to the glory of God, and our mutual edification¹." The Primus then invited the clergy to declare their sentiments in regard to the measure now proposed to them; when his son, Mr. John Skinner, priest at Forfar, cited some extracts from approved writers of the church of England, shewing that the Articles now to be adopted are neither Calvinistic, Antinomian, nor Pelagian, but in all points agreeable to the revealed Word and will of God. He added,—“I do now willingly, and *ex animo*, consent to the adoption of the Articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, as the Articles of religion of the church to which I belong, acknowledging all and every one of them to be, in my opinion, agreeable to the Word of God. For after mature investigation, I find that to the Calvinist the Articles declare the doctrine of universal redemption; to the Pelagian they assert the existence of original or birth sin; to the Antinomian they declare that good works are a *sine qua non* of salvation, though not the meritorious cause of it. To the Latitudinarian they avow, that ‘they are to be accursed who presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature;’ while they teach the Romanist, that ‘we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,’ by faith, and neither for our own works or deservings, nor for the supererogatory works of saints².”

THE PRIMUS then put the question, “whether the rest of the clergy present agreed in this sentiment?” They all answered according to seniority in the affirmative, and declared their readiness to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles in the form and manner required by the Act of Toleration passed anno 1792. The following preamble was drawn up, and engrossed on a large sheet of vellum:—“We, the bishops and clergy of the episcopal church of Scotland, assembled in a Convention holden at Laurencekirk, in the county of Kincardine, on the 24th day of October, in the year of Our Lord, 1804, having taken into our serious consideration the obligation which we lie under, to provide, as far as we are able, for the preservation of truth, unity, and concord in that small

¹ Annals, Appendix, 549.

² Annals, 347.

portion of the church committed to our charge; and having observed, with regret, owing to the confusions of the times, and the various difficulties which the episcopacy of Scotland had to encounter, even when established by law, that no public confession of faith has been prescribed or handed down to us, who have thought it our duty to adhere to that ecclesiastical constitution, which we believe to be truly apostolical;—under these circumstances, WE are unanimously of opinion, that it would be highly expedient to exhibit some public testimony of our agreement in doctrine and discipline with the United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established; and for that purpose, to give a solemn declaration of our assent to her Thirty-nine Articles of religion, in the words and form of subscription required by the Act of the 32d of his present majesty, &c.—

“RESOLVED, therefore, as we now are, by the grace of Almighty God, to adopt these articles as the public test or standard of the religious principles of our church:—WE, whose names are underwritten, the bishops and pastors of congregations of the episcopal communion in Scotland, meeting for divine worship at the several places annexed to our respective names, do willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to the BOOK OF ARTICLES OF RELIGION agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces of the realm of England, and the clergy thereof in the convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord 1562; and we do acknowledge all and every the articles therein contained, being in number thirty-nine, besides the Ratification, *to be agreeable to the word of God*. And we, the subscribing bishops, have also resolved in future to require from all candidates for holy orders in our church, previously to their being ordained, a similar subscription¹.”

THE BISHOPS and clergy immediately subscribed the above preamble and articles, according to their rank and seniority, and the document was committed to the primus's charge, to be lodged for preservation in the ecclesiastical chest of Aberdeen; the primus was also requested to communicate the proceedings of this convocation to the archbishops and bishops of the united church of England and Ireland. As soon as possible afterwards, the primus addressed a circular letter to all the prelates of the united church of England and Ireland, and received in return the most gratifying and satisfactory answers from each of them; extracts from all of them are given by Mr. Skinner, each expressing the truest brotherly affection

¹ Annals, 348, 349.

our sins are thereby mystically washed away. But although these independent clergymen were true priests, yet their having lapsed into schism placed their gifts in *abeyance* during their continuance in that schism; and as they had rebelled against God, they could not represent Him, and therefore He was not bound by their acts. But their repentance, however, and return to the communion of the true church, with the laying on of the bishops' hands in confirmation, *removed* the impediment which had stopped the current of divine grace, and made their acts potential; and the seven-fold grace of the Holy Spirit was then made effectual which before had been in *abeyance*, through their separation and Korah-like gainsaying.

THOSE INDEPENDENTS that still hold out, and those also who have recently apostatised, would do well to consider with what severity the apostle speaks of schism, or of those who "forsake the assembling of themselves together;" which is his manner of describing schism. For, says he, "if we sin wilfully" in separating from the church, "after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." As these men have cast themselves out of the mystical body of Christ, and cut themselves off from the communion of the church, they have *renounced* the covenant of their God, and therefore they can only plead His *uncovenanted* mercy, but not His *faithfulness*. The church is the spouse of Christ, to bring forth children unto God by adding to the church daily; and from the arms of our mother, the church, our heavenly Father receives his children, and has decreed that there is no other ordinary way of entering into the kingdom of heaven. The promises of the gospel were made to the church general, and to none other; and those who unjustly separate themselves from her family cut themselves off from communion with God, and consequently they forfeit their right to all the promises of the gospel, which were made only to "the whole family in heaven and earth." They cannot plead God's covenant, because they have renounced it. They may plead that He is *merciful*, but, as He has entered into no covenant with them, they cannot plead that He is *faithful* and just to forgive their sins, to which He is only bound in baptism by that priest who is His representative, and that is in full communion with the catholic church, which they are not.

CHAPTER LXXVIII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN SKINNER,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1804.—Rev. Dr. Sandford united with the church.—Bishop Porteus's letter.
—— 1805.—Progress of the Union.—Rev. A. Alison.—Rev. R. Morehead.
—The church in Banff.—Dr. Grant—his apology.—Bishop Horsley's answer.
—— 1806.—Dr. Sandford elect of Edinburgh.—Self-denial of the Scottish clergy.—More congregations added to the church.—Consecration of Dr. Sandford—Mr. Walker's sermon.—Bishop Skinner's address.—Circular letter to the English and Irish prelates.—Number of the congregations that had joined the church, and that were still in schism.—Bishop Sandford's first confirmation.—A fund instituted.—Sir William Forbes' benevolence—and appeal.—Sums distributed.—1807-8.—Death of Bishop Watson—his character.—Lord Gardenstone—builds and endows the church of Laurencekirk.—Bishop Torry elected and consecrated.—Dr. Gleig elected to the bishoprick of Brechin.—Communion office.—Dr. Gleig's consecration.—1809.—Death of bishop Abernethy Drummond.—A thanksgiving, and an address to the throne.—Death of bishop Strachan—his family.—1810.—Bishop Gleig's charge.—1811.—A general synod at Aberdeen—its constitution.—Canon recognising the *primary* authority of the Scottish communion office.—1812.—The establishment.—1813.—General Assembly.—1814-15.—Act against non-residence.—1816.—Assembly.—Death of the Primus—remarks—his labours.—Church of England disclaims the Independent clergy.—Some causes of weakness.—Extract from the funeral service.—Bishop Walker's opinion.

1804.—ALL THE ENGLISH and Irish bishops most cordially approved of the Resolution of the Laurencekirk Convocation, and this important and laudable step may be said to have consolidated the two churches. The good effects immediately followed. The Rev. Dr. Sandford wrote to the Primus, on the 19th of November, as follows:—"I consider this as one of the happiest days of my life. I have to-day, in presence of the REV. MR. WALKER and the Rev. Mr. Adam, subscribed

the Articles, which unite me and my flock to your venerable church. I am exceedingly glad to tell you, that my little paper has been received with the greatest good will. Not a dissenting voice have I heard. Those of my subscribers and hearers, with whom I have conversed, and from whom I have received letters on the occasion, have, with one voice, approved our union. I hope everything is done as you would wish, and that I now may be considered as one of your clergy, and as such receive your license to my charge. I wait with some impatience your acceptance of my subscription.—(Signed), Daniel Sandford, D.D.”

THE PRIMUS lost no time in returning a satisfactory answer to Dr. Sandford. In a private letter from the Rev. E. Hodgson, domestic chaplain to Dr. Porteus, bishop of London, to bishop Skinner, he gave an extract of that prelate’s letter to sir William Forbes; in which Dr. Porteus says,—“I have no hesitation in saying, that as the Scottish bishops have now made a declaration of their assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and offer the English clergy the use of their own eucharistical liturgy, there seems to be no reasonable objection to an union of those two bodies; and I am persuaded that such an union would conduce greatly to the interests of religion in that part of the united kingdom, because it would restore what was extremely wanted there—the benefit of episcopal superintendence—the benefit of a licensed clergy—the apostolical rite of confirmation, and the consecration of their places of public worship; which things are all plainly necessary to constitute and preserve a regular episcopal church¹.”

1805.—“THE YEAR 1805, says the annalist, commenced no less auspiciously than the preceding year had concluded. The friends of union multiplied everywhere, and gladdened the hearts of its zealous promoters in England as well as in Scotland. Congratulatory letters were poured in on bishop Skinner from each side of the Tweed, on the success of his labours, and on the rapid progress of ecclesiastical unity and order, now to receive such additional sanction and support, as made their speedy consummation, in the Scottish metropolis, a matter no longer of doubt, but of certainty. On the 26th of February a regular deed was drawn up by the trustees and vestrymen of the English episcopal chapel in Edinburgh, originally founded by the Right Hon. Lord Chief Baron Smith, acknowledging the episcopal church in Scotland to be a pure

¹ Cited in *Annals*, 362.

and primitive part of the orthodox church of Christ, and binding the subscribers to pay that spiritual obedience to the episcopacy of Scotland which the members of episcopal congregations owe to their spiritual superiors¹."

THE DOCUMENT above alluded to is signed only by the vestrymen. It was a collegiate charge; the office of the junior minister was vacant, and the senior minister, Mr. Archibald Alison, the father of the distinguished historian of Europe, held living and other preferments in England. His selfish fears suggested to him that he might possibly lose his preferments in England if he should comply, and therefore he deferred his decision till his doubts on such an interesting subject were cleared up. In the meantime the vestry appointed the rev. Robert Morehead, who was in English orders, and the incumbent of the chapel at Leith, to be the junior minister of the Cowgate, or baron Smith's chapel. He resolved to conform to the church, and he signed the declaration or formula on the 30th April, and bishop Skinner directed Dr. Sandford to give him institution. Here was a congregation and one of the clergy who had conformed, but whose first or senior clergyman still remained in a state of schism! To satisfy his fears, William Forbes wrote to sir William Scott, to inquire whether or not a clergyman holding preferments in the church of England, and officiating in Scotland, would lose them upon conforming to the catholic church of Scotland. It was a month of September, however, before an answer was received from sir William Scott, who wrote,—“You may be assured that the new archbishop [Dr. Charles Manners Sutton] holds all the sentiments of affection and respect for the episcopal church in Scotland which you know his lamented predecessor entertained, and will be ready to express it on all occasions. . . . His opinion concurs with mine, that a minister of the church of England *can incur no disability* in England by communicating with the sister church, if that can be called a sister which, by the late acts of your respectable community, is become almost identically the same. It is quite impossible that any impropriety, either legal or (as far as I may be allowed to judge) theological, can attach to an entire conformity to the protestant episcopal church in Scotland during a clergyman's residence in that country. It is surprising how such a notion could have found its way into the minds of men in your country, as that the English bishops aspired to any authority there².” This lion in the way having now been

¹ Annals, 263.² Cited in Annals, 389.

church respecting the oath of abjuration. But, says he, "there is another point of nonconformity, however, which as to the legislature is civil, but as to English priests is also spiritual—I mean the Thirty-nine Articles, which the Act of 1792 requires to be assented to by the Scottish episcopal churchmen, in order to give them the benefits of toleration. For want of this, it is thought by some that the Scottish episcopal church is exceptionable; first, as having no confessional; and, secondly, as not acknowledging the king's supremacy, as thereby declared in the 37th Article. . . . If the Scotch bishops were to adopt these Articles, with the trifling variations for Scotland, instead of England, as belonging to their church, to sign them as such, and to require the signature of them at ordinations, I do think it would materially affect some opinions worthy of attention¹."

THE PRIMUS adopted this hint, and at his diocesan synod in August he submitted the proposal to his own clergy of holding a convocation of the whole church, for the purpose of considering the design of subscription, as suggested above. They cordially acquiesced, and earnestly requested the bishop forthwith to submit the matter "to the serious and solemn consideration of the whole church." The other bishops being also agreeable to subscription, and concurring in the wishes of the Primus, a circular was issued on the 11th of September, summoning the clergy to meet in the chapel of the village of Laurencekirk on Wednesday, the 24th October, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, "to exhibit, in the most solemn manner, a testimony of our conformity in doctrine and discipline with the church of England, and thereby to remove every remaining obstacle to the union of the episcopalians in Scotland." The Primus transmitted a copy of his summons to the REV. DR. SANDFORD, an English clergyman, who then officiated in a hall in West Register Street, which was afterwards occupied by Mr. John Moir as a printing-office. As an individual, Dr. Sandford stated, in reply to the Primus, that if "this testimony of your agreement with the church of England be given in the solemn way which you propose, and our Thirty-nine Articles be thus made the permanent confessional of the Scotch episcopal church, there can be *no objection* to our union." The Primus at one time intended to have proposed the adoption of a preamble, disclaiming "the absurd Calvinistic sense" which some of its subscribers had forced upon the XVII. Article, but he was induced to abandon this intention at the suggestion

¹ Annals, 329-332.

of sir William Forbes. After having stated his objections to the intended preamble, sir William says,—“ Perhaps, therefore, it will be best that the Articles be subscribed agreeably to the Act 1792, as they stand in the service-book of the church of England, and prefaced as they are there with the royal declaration; every subscriber explaining them to himself according to what seems most consonant to the Word of God, and according to the practice in England¹.”

THE CONVOCATION met in the chapel of Laurencekirk on the 24th of October, and there were present bishop Skinner, of Aberdeen, the Primus; bishop Macfarlane, of Ross and Argyle; bishop Watson, of Dunkeld, and bishop Jolly, of Moray; also thirty-eight priests, and two deacons. Bishop Abernethy Drummond, of Glasgow, and bishop Strachan, of Brechin, were prevented by old age and infirmity from attending. In anticipation of the junction of the clergy in Edinburgh, Dr. Abernethy Drummond resigned that see, that some one of the English conforming clergy might be promoted to it. Prayers were read by the bishop of Dunkeld, and the Primus delivered a discourse, which is now before me, on the subject of the Articles, in which he made a brief, but most excellent, commentary upon each. “ If,” he says, “ those Articles of religion are to be considered as a form of this kind [whereby we may declare our agreement in doctrine and discipline with the united church of England and Ireland], and such I think is the light in which we may justly behold them, we cannot, then, do better than join with the church of England, in adopting them as the standard of our christian doctrine, and thus supply a want which we have long lamented, by making them the public and permanent confessional of our church².”

ON THE DISMISSAL of the lay members of the congregation, bishop Skinner solemnly pronounced the meeting “ A CONVOCATION OF THE BISHOPS AND CLERGY OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.” The bishops severally delivered their opinions, and bishop Jolly read a long and excellent address; in the conclusion of which, he said,—“ The learned Mr. Daubeney agrees with those who acknowledge that some of the Articles ‘ might have been better expressed;’ and that ‘ though an admirable, yet they are an improvable form of sound words.’ Much more might we in Scotland claim our right of expressing that true sense of them [anti-Calvinistic] which he and other worthy churchmen have so fully evinced in words

¹ Annals, 334-341.

² Sermon, 2 Tim. i. 13, p. 29.

less liable to be misunderstood. But instead of a new form, *we adopt and embrace theirs*, out of our love and desire of unity and concord; that, being of one heart and mind in our one Lord Jesus Christ, we may, as with one mouth, all speak the same thing, to the glory of God, and our mutual edification¹." The Primus then invited the clergy to declare their sentiments in regard to the measure now proposed to them; when his son, Mr. John Skinner, priest at Forfar, cited some extracts from approved writers of the church of England, shewing that the Articles now to be adopted are neither Calvinistic, Antinomian, nor Pelagian, but in all points agreeable to the revealed Word and will of God. He added,—“I do now willingly, and *ex animo*, consent to the adoption of the Articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, as the Articles of religion of the church to which I belong, acknowledging all and every one of them to be, in my opinion, agreeable to the Word of God. For after mature investigation, I find that to the Calvinist the Articles declare the doctrine of universal redemption; to the Pelagian they assert the existence of original or birth sin; to the Antinomian they declare that good works are a *sine qua non* of salvation, though not the meritorious cause of it. To the Latitudinarian they avow, that ‘they are to be accursed who presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature;’ while they teach the Romanist, that ‘we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,’ by faith, and neither for our own works or deservings, nor for the supererogatory works of saints².”

THE PRIMUS then put the question, “whether the rest of the clergy present agreed in this sentiment?” They all answered according to seniority in the affirmative, and declared their readiness to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles in the form and manner required by the Act of Toleration passed anno 1792. The following preamble was drawn up, and engrossed on a large sheet of vellum:—“We, the bishops and clergy of the episcopal church of Scotland, assembled in a Convention holden at Laurencekirk, in the county of Kincardine, on the 24th day of October, in the year of Our Lord, 1804, having taken into our serious consideration the obligation which we lie under, to provide, as far as we are able, for the preservation of truth, unity, and concord in that small

¹ Annals, Appendix, 549.

² Annals, 347.

portion of the church committed to our charge; and having observed, with regret, owing to the confusions of the times, and the various difficulties which the episcopacy of Scotland had to encounter, even when established by law, that no public confession of faith has been prescribed or handed down to us, who have thought it our duty to adhere to that ecclesiastical constitution, which we believe to be truly apostolical;—under these circumstances, WE are unanimously of opinion, that it would be highly expedient to exhibit some public testimony of our agreement in doctrine and discipline with the United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established; and for that purpose, to give a solemn declaration of our assent to her Thirty-nine Articles of religion, in the words and form of subscription required by the Act of the 32d of his present majesty, &c.—

“RESOLVED, therefore, as we now are, by the grace of Almighty God, to adopt these articles as the public test or standard of the religious principles of our church:—WE, whose names are underwritten, the bishops and pastors of congregations of the episcopal communion in Scotland, meeting for divine worship at the several places annexed to our respective names, do willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to the BOOK OF ARTICLES OF RELIGION agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces of the realm of England, and the clergy thereof in the convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord 1562; and we do acknowledge all and every the articles therein contained, being in number thirty-nine, besides the Ratification, *to be agreeable to the word of God*. And we, the subscribing bishops, have also resolved in future to require from all candidates for holy orders in our church, previously to their being ordained, a similar subscription¹.”

THE BISHOPS and clergy immediately subscribed the above preamble and articles, according to their rank and seniority, and the document was committed to the primus's charge, to be lodged for preservation in the ecclesiastical chest of Aberdeen; the primus was also requested to communicate the proceedings of this convocation to the archbishops and bishops of the united church of England and Ireland. As soon as possible afterwards, the primus addressed a circular letter to all the prelates of the united church of England and Ireland, and received in return the most gratifying and satisfactory answers from each of them; extracts from all of them are given by Mr. Skinner, each expressing the truest brotherly affection

¹ Annals, 348, 349.

our sins are thereby mystically washed away. But although these independent clergymen were true priests, yet their having lapsed into schism placed their gifts in *abeyance* during their continuance in that schism; and as they had rebelled against God, they could not represent Him, and therefore He was not bound by their acts. But their repentance, however, and return to the communion of the true church, with the laying on of the bishops' hands in confirmation, *removed* the impediment which had stopped the current of divine grace, and made their acts potential; and the seven-fold grace of the Holy Spirit was then made effectual which before had been in *abeyance*, through their separation and Korah-like gainsaying.

THOSE INDEPENDENTS that still hold out, and those also who have recently apostatised, would do well to consider with what severity the apostle speaks of schism, or of those who "for-sake the assembling of themselves together;" which is his manner of describing schism. For, says he, "if we sin wilfully" in separating from the church, "after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." As these men have cast themselves out of the mystical body of Christ, and cut themselves off from the communion of the church, they have *renounced* the covenant of their God, and therefore they can only plead His *uncovenanted* mercy, but not His *faithfulness*. The church is the spouse of Christ, to bring forth children unto God by adding to the church daily; and from the arms of our mother, the church, our heavenly Father receives his children, and has decreed that there is no other ordinary way of entering into the kingdom of heaven. The promises of the gospel were made to the church general, and to none other; and those who unjustly separate themselves from her family cut themselves off from communion with God, and consequently they forfeit their right to all the promises of the gospel, which were made only to "the whole family in heaven and earth." They cannot plead God's covenant, because they have renounced it. They may plead that He is *merciful*, but, as He has entered into no covenant with them, they cannot plead that He is *faithful* and just to forgive their sins, to which He is only bound in baptism by that priest who is His representative, and that is in full communion with the catholic church, which they are not.

CHAPTER LXXVIII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN SKINNER,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1804.—Rev. Dr. Sandford united with the church.—Bishop Porteus's letter.
— **1805.**—Progress of the Union.—Rev. A. Alison.—Rev. R. Morehead.
—The church in Banff.—Dr. Grant—his apology.—Bishop Horsley's answer.
— **1806.**—Dr. Sandford elect of Edinburgh.—Self-denial of the Scottish clergy.—More congregations added to the church.—Consecration of Dr. Sandford—Mr. Walker's sermon.—Bishop Skinner's address.—Circular letter to the English and Irish prelates.—Number of the congregations that had joined the church, and that were still in schism.—Bishop Sandford's first confirmation.—A fund instituted.—Sir William Forbes' benevolence—and appeal.—Sums distributed.— **1807-8.**—Death of Bishop Watson—his character.—Lord Gardenstone—builds and endows the church of Laurencekirk.—Bishop Torry elected and consecrated.—Dr. Gleig elected to the bishoprick of Brechin.—Communion office.—Dr. Gleig's consecration.— **1809.**—Death of bishop Abernethy Drummond.—A thanksgiving, and an address to the throne.—Death of bishop Strachan—his family.— **1810.**—Bishop Gleig's charge.— **1811.**—A general synod at Aberdeen—its constitution.—Canon recognising the *primary* authority of the Scottish communion office.— **1812.**—The establishment.— **1813.**—General Assembly.— **1814-15.**—Act against non-residence.— **1816.**—Assembly.—Death of the Primus—remarks—his labours.—Church of England disclaims the Independent clergy.—Some causes of weakness.—Extract from the funeral service.—Bishop Walker's opinion.

1804.—ALL THE ENGLISH and Irish bishops most cordially approved of the Resolution of the Laurencekirk Convocation, and this important and laudable step may be said to have consolidated the two churches. The good effects immediately followed. The Rev. Dr. Sandford wrote to the Primus, on the 19th of November, as follows:—"I consider this as one of the happiest days of my life. I have to-day, in presence of the REV. MR. WALKER and the Rev. Mr. Adam, subscribed

the Articles, which unite me and my flock to your venerable church. I am exceedingly glad to tell you, that my little paper has been received with the greatest good will. Not a dissenting voice have I heard. Those of my subscribers and hearers, with whom I have conversed, and from whom I have received letters on the occasion, have, with one voice, approved our union. I hope everything is done as you would wish, and that I now may be considered as one of your clergy, and as such receive your license to my charge. I wait with some impatience your acceptance of my subscription.—(Signed), Daniel Sandford, D.D.”

THE PRIMUS lost no time in returning a satisfactory answer to Dr. Sandford. In a private letter from the Rev. E. Hodgson, domestic chaplain to Dr. Porteus, bishop of London, to bishop Skinner, he gave an extract of that prelate’s letter to sir William Forbes; in which Dr. Porteus says,—“I have no hesitation in saying, that as the Scottish bishops have now made a declaration of their assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and offer the English clergy the use of their own eucharistical liturgy, there seems to be no reasonable objection to an union of those two bodies; and I am persuaded that such an union would conduce greatly to the interests of religion in that part of the united kingdom, because it would restore what was extremely wanted there—the benefit of episcopal superintendence—the benefit of a licensed clergy—the apostolical rite of confirmation, and the consecration of their places of public worship; which things are all plainly necessary to constitute and preserve a regular episcopal church¹.”

1805.—“THE YEAR 1805, says the annalist, commenced no less auspiciously than the preceding year had concluded. The friends of union multiplied everywhere, and gladdened the hearts of its zealous promoters in England as well as in Scotland. Congratulatory letters were poured in on bishop Skinner from each side of the Tweed, on the success of his labours, and on the rapid progress of ecclesiastical unity and order, now to receive such additional sanction and support, as made their speedy consummation, in the Scottish metropolis, a matter no longer of doubt, but of certainty. On the 26th of February a regular deed was drawn up by the trustees and vestrymen of the English episcopal chapel in Edinburgh, originally founded by the Right Hon. Lord Chief Baron Smith, acknowledging the episcopal church in Scotland to be a pure

¹ Cited in *Annals*, 362.

and primitive part of the orthodox church of Christ, and binding the subscribers to pay that spiritual obedience to the episcopacy of Scotland which the members of episcopal congregations owe to their spiritual superiors¹."

THE DOCUMENT above alluded to is signed only by the vestrymen. It was a collegiate charge; the office of the junior minister was vacant, and the senior minister, Mr. Archibald Alison, the father of the distinguished historian of Europe, held a living and other preferments in England. His selfish fears suggested to him that he might possibly lose his preferments in England if he should comply, and therefore he deferred his decision till his doubts on such an interesting subject were cleared up. In the meantime the vestry appointed the rev. Robert Morehead, who was in English orders, and the incumbent of the chapel at Leith, to be the junior minister of the Cowgate, or baron Smith's chapel. He resolved to conform to the church, and he signed the declaration or formula on the 30th of April, and bishop Skinner directed Dr. Sandford to give him institution. Here was a congregation and one of the clergy who had conformed, but whose first or senior clergyman still remained in a state of schism! To satisfy his fears, Mr. William Forbes wrote to sir William Scott, to inquire whether or not a clergyman holding preferments in the church of England, and officiating in Scotland, would lose them upon conforming to the catholic church of Scotland. It was the month of September, however, before an answer was received from sir William Scott, who wrote,—“You may be assured that the new archbishop [Dr. Charles Manners Sutton] feels all the sentiments of affection and respect for the episcopal church in Scotland which you know his lamented predecessor entertained, and will be ready to express it on all occasions. . . . His opinion concurs with mine, that a minister of the church of England *can incur no disability* in England by communicating with the sister church, if that can be called a sister which, by the late acts of your respectable community, is become almost identically the same. It is quite impossible that any impropriety, either legal or (as far as I may be allowed to judge) theological, can attach to an entire conformity to the protestant episcopal church in Scotland during a clergyman's residence in that country. It is surprising how such a notion could have found its way into the minds of men in your country, as that the English bishops aspired to any authority there².” This lion in the way having now been

¹ Annals, 263.

² Cited in Annals, 389.

removed, Mr. Alison signed the articles of agreement on the 24th of November, and was duly received into the church.

A CAPTAIN CUMMING, of his majesty's service, residing in Banff, pretended, that by uniting with the church of Scotland, the English congregation of that town had abandoned the principles in support of which their chapel had been built ; and in proof of his allegation, amongst other things, he "insisted that the Scottish bishops are no bishops, because they preside over a church which *wants the sanction* of civil establishment." In order to accomplish a dissolution of this union, Cumming entered an action before the supreme court ; but there the case was decided in favour of the church. This involved Mr. Milne, the clergyman, and his vestrymen, in an expense of about £200 ; a debt that they were perfectly unable to discharge from their very limited funds, which were before "*scarcely adequate to afford a decent maintenance to their pastor.*" A statement of all the circumstances of the case was forwarded to bishop Horsley, by Mr. Milne, with the approbation of his own bishop ; when that worthy father of the church "actually became a beggar," and raised rather more than the sum required, and remitted it to bishop Skinner, to be paid to Mr. Milne. "I applied," says bishop Horsley, "to none but bishops ; for I thought that a more general application would be neither for your credit nor our own¹."

IN THE COURSE of this year, a Dr. Grant, an independent minister in Dundee, published a pamphlet, now before me, which he entitled an "Apology for continuing in the Communion of the Church of England ;" but upon perusal of it, it turns out rather to be a libel upon the catholic church of Scotland, and a defence of his own schism in refusing to renounce it and yield obedience to bishop Strachan, the ordinary of the diocese of Brechin. That his Apology might not sink into merited oblivion, Dr. Grant forwarded a copy of it to each of the English bishops ; but whose answers he carefully concealed from the public. It was not, however, in his power to conceal bishop Horsley's, because that prelate sent a copy of it to bishop Skinner, as follows :—"It has long been my opinion, and very well known, I believe, to be my opinion, that the laity in Scotland of the episcopal persuasion, if they understand the genuine principles of episcopacy which they profess, ought, in the present state of things, to resort to the ministry of their indigenous pastors. And the clergymen of English or Irish ordination, exercising their functions in Scot-

¹ Annals, 376-386.

, without uniting with the Scottish bishops, are, in my
ment, doing nothing better than keeping alive a schism.
I nothing in your tract to alter my mind upon these points.
are in a very great mistake in supposing that ‘the dissen-
n England are required to subscribe any one of our Arti-
previous to their chapels being licensed¹.’” Dr. Grant
not satisfied with bishop Horsley’s brief and blunt letter,
continued a schismatic to the day of his death. The
le who adhered to his ministration, after his death returned
e church. There was one clergyman still in Edinburgh
held out, viz. Mr. Vincent, of St. George’s Chapel.

06.—THE DIOCESE of Edinburgh had been vacant for
time, in consequence of the resignation of bishop Aber-
Drummond, and the present state of that diocese being
y satisfactory, the primus issued a mandate to the dean
lery of the diocese empowering them to elect a bishop for
acant see. In his letter to sir William Forbes, the primus
—“There is at present no matter of ecclesiastical concern
n I believe my colleagues as well as myself have more at
than to see a sound, well-informed, and respectable clergy-
at the head of the diocese of Edinburgh. By our canons,
matter must be referred to the choice of the clergy of the
se, and the bishops have only a negative, should an im-
er person in their opinion be chosen; yet I humbly hope
on their part every thing will be done to procure to our
ch in Edinburgh a respectable diocesan, and to our epis-
college the succession of a pious, learned, and dignified
per.” The 15th of January was fixed for the day of elec-
and Dr. Sandford was elected with perfect unanimity.
e honour of the original clergy of Scottish ordination in
liocese, they sank all their own pretensions to that dignity,
or the sake of the peace and prosperity of the church
ally gave their votes for one of those clergy of English
ation, who had so recently conformed. This act of gene-
self-denial is respectfully noticed in an official paper,
d by the three English clergymen, and transmitted to the
is, as follows:—“At this first meeting of the united epis-
churches in the diocese of Edinburgh, assembled for the
on of a bishop, we, the undersigned, ministers of the
ch of England, desire leave to record the following, our
amous resolutions:—1st. That however well we are con-
d of the merits and qualifications of the rev. gentleman
has this day been elected bishop of this diocese, we are,

¹ Annals, 391.

at this time, deeply sensible of the candid and generous liberality which has induced the presbyters of the church in Scotland, in the present circumstances, to propose unanimously to concur in the election of a clergyman of English ordination. And, 2dly, That, while we consider the measure as a happy omen of the stability of that union of the episcopal churches which has been recommended to us, not only by our own sense of duty, but by the highest authorities in the church of England, we feel it at the same time incumbent upon us to express, in the most lasting manner in our power, the sense we entertain of the charitable and enlightened spirit which has animated the members of the church in Scotland, in this, and in every measure by which that union has been accomplished. Signed, Henry Lloyd, D.D., minister of Leith ; Archibald Alison, LL.B. senior, minister of the Cowgate Chapel ; Robert Morehead, A.M. junior, ditto¹."

ALONG WITH the above communication, sir William Forbes wrote to the primus congratulating him on the election "of a bishop of Edinburgh of the most primitive and exemplary character." Dr. Lloyd, "minister of Leith," who was regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, accepted the charge of the episcopal chapel in Leith after the removal of Mr. Morehead to the Cowgate Chapel. He applied to the bishop of Lincoln for his advice respecting the union with the Scottish church, who briefly recommended him "to go into the union," which he must have done previous to the election of Dr. Sandford, else he could not have voted at it. About the same time, the Rev. William Routledge, of St. Andrews Chapel, Glasgow, with his congregation, were also added to the church. The Rev. — Fenwick, of Perth, also, with his flock, joined the company of the faithful ; but his successor, Mr. Skeete, with that congregation, apostatised from the faith, and have walked no more with their brethren² : a circumstance that marks how ill they had been instructed in the first principles of the religion which they profess. The minister and congregation at Perth still continue in a state of schism and independency.

AS SOON AS the primus had received the bishop-elect's acceptance of the unanimous suffrages of his brethren, he lost no time in officially announcing his election to the other prelates, and of requiring their consent to his consecration. There could be no possible objections on the part of the right reverend bench ; and the primus, on receiving their concurrence, appointed the elect to be consecrated at Dundee on

¹ Annals, 401.

² Ibid. 403.

Sexagesima Sunday, the 9th of February. On that day, bishop Skinner, assisted by bishops Watson and Jolly, consecrated Dr. Daniel Sandford in bishop Watson's chapel, in the presence of a numerous audience. The sermon was preached by bishop Sandford's intimate friend, the **REV. JAMES WALKER**, from Titus ii. 15,—“Let no man despise thee.” At the request of the bishops and clergy present, the sermon was published, with a preface, and dedication to the **REV. GEORGE GLEIG**, from whom Mr. Walker acknowledged to have received many important favours in the early period of his professional life, and “an uninterrupted course of confidence and friendship.” At the conclusion of the sacred rite, the primus read a long address, “with an energy and feeling that sensibly affected the whole auditory ;” of which the following is an extract :—

“With what sincerity of heart, therefore, may we hail the solemnity of this day, as affording ample cause of congratulation—congratulation offered first of all to you, my beloved brother in Christ, as the principal instrument in that good work which God has this day called us to perform ; and congratulation to that particular body of clergy whom you are henceforth to take under your episcopal charge ; and who are here most properly represented by the reverend presbyter, whose discourse from the pulpit, prepared at your desire, we have listened to with all the satisfaction which a subject so aptly chosen could impart, and with all the delight which the judicious, clear, and pertinent manner in which it was handled, could excite. Nor can I refrain, my right reverend colleagues, from extending my congratulations to you, on the acquisition to our sacred order of one so worthy of the office to which you have assisted in promoting him, and so justly entitled to the best thanks, the warmest approbation, the most cordial support, that we can give him in return for his giving himself to the work of our ministry, and to the cultivation of the same humble portion of the Lord's vineyard in which we have been appointed to labour ; thus making our little national church his own, and agreeing to co-operate with us, as we are ever disposed to co-operate with each other, in promoting its best and truest interests. Nay, I would congratulate the whole Scotch episcopal church, in its laity as well as in its clergy (represented, as I may be allowed to hold them represented, by the respectable body of clergy and people now before me), on the happy event of this day,—an event no less singular than, I trust, it will be found auspicious ; being the first of the kind which our church has witnessed since deprived of the benefit of a civil establishment, and therefore, I hope, to be

considered as a presage of increasing union and communion with the episcopal church in the other parts of the British empire, which is still blessed (and long may the united church of England and Ireland be blessed !) with the full enjoyment of that benefit¹."

BISHOP HORSLEY suggested to the primus the propriety of informing the English prelates of the progress of the good work, and of the advancement of Dr. Sandford to the episcopate. He accordingly addressed a circular letter to the English archbishops and bishops, and to the archbishops of Armagh and Dublin ; an extract from which is here given on account of the statistical information contained in it. ". . . . The congregations which composed all that remains of the old established church of Scotland, are, at present, about sixty in number, and are supplied by fifty clergymen ordained by the Scottish bishops ; a few of these congregations being at this time vacant, either by the recent death of their former pastors, or through want of ability to make sufficient provision for supporting the pastoral character in a suitable and decent manner. A few years ago there were about twenty-four congregations in Scotland in a state of separation from the Scottish episcopal church, and supplied by clergymen of English or of Irish ordination, with no other episcopal connection than what their ordination and the use of the English liturgy afforded. Thirteen of these congregations have of late joined the communion of the Scottish episcopal church, sensible of the anomalous state in which, as episcopalians, their being in communion with no bishop placed them, viz. two in the city of Edinburgh, and one in each of the following places :—Leith, Kelso, Glasgow, Stirling, Perth, Arbroath, Stonehaven, Cruden, Peterhead, Banff, and Elgin. Of the other eleven congregations still in a state of separation, there is one in Edinburgh, Musselburgh, Haddington, Dundee, Dunkeld, Brechin, Montrose, Aberdeen (two clergy), Old Deer, Ayr, and Dumfries. On the whole, it appears that thirteen clergymen, ordained by English or Irish bishops, now form a part of the ministry of the Scottish episcopal church ; and it may be hoped that the other eleven will sooner or later see the propriety of adopting the same salutary measure. As an encouragement to this, we have lately, my lord, had the happiness of making a very respectable addition to the number of our bishops, by the consecration of Dr. Sandford, of Christ Church College, Oxford, an English clergyman in the city of Edin-

¹ Cited in *Annals*, 404-418.

gh, of most exemplary character, and who I trust will be a blessing and an ornament to our church¹."

THE REPLIES received from all the English prelates expressed utmost satisfaction at the progress the union was making; bishop Horsley congratulated himself on the verification of his prognostication to bishop Abernethy Drummond, some years before, "that the business of the union would certainly go itself, if he was not too much in a hurry to drive it on." The bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Douglas, a Scotchman, expressed hope "that no more young men will be sent from England to serve as ministers to your chapels," at least in an independent capacity. Bishop Sandford held his first confirmation in Cowgate Chapel, when upwards of a hundred young persons received that sealing ordinance, in the presence of a numerous congregation chiefly of the upper ranks of life².

THE UNEXAMPLED poverty and consequent distress of the clergy, at last excited the sympathy of several influential individuals; foremost among these was sir William Forbes and his son-in-law, Colin Mackenzie, esq. of Portmore. They suggested to sir William not only the propriety, but the necessity, of creating a fund by subscription, the money subscribed to be vested in trustees chosen by the contributors, and then laid out in government securities, or on mortgages on landed estates. Sir William Forbes headed this subscription with £200, and left £200 more in his will to be paid by his executors. Sir William drew up a memorial, which, in the best possible words, recapitulated the chief events of the history of the church from the Revolution to that time, and concluded with the following interesting appeal to the justice of his countrymen:—"In this comfortable state at which the congregations of the episcopal church in Scotland have so long arrived, it is at the same time matter of great grief to them to see their bishops and pastors unable to support that eminent rank in society to which, by their piety and learning, as well as modest, inoffensive behaviour, they are so justly entitled, and which is necessary to give weight to their characters and effect to their public ministrations. The bishop of Edinburgh particularly, who is placed in a somewhat more conspicuous point of view, and by consequence subjected to some more expense than his brethren, must unavoidably have many difficulties of that nature to struggle with. The number of bishops is six, and that of the inferior clergy over the

¹ Annals, 419-21.

² Sir William Forbes' Letter to Bishop Skinner, cited in Annals, &c.

whole of Scotland amounts only to about fifty, many of whom, and one, at least, of the bishops, preside over congregations so very limited in point of number, and in such narrow circumstances, that the emoluments arising from them *scarcely exceed the wages of a day-labourer* ! To see gentlemen who have had a liberal, and, in almost every case, an University education, *with such pitiful appointments*, must be matter of sincere regret to every well-disposed and thinking christian. To make some improvement, therefore, on their situations, seems to be an object highly deserving of attention . . . It must also be recorded to their credit, that no complaint of the narrowness of their situations has ever escaped the episcopal clergy in Scotland ; and they have gone on in the discharge of their duty contentedly, struggling with all the hardships above alluded to. It has, therefore, occurred to some persons of that persuasion in Edinburgh, that it were desirable to form a fund for making a moderate addition to the incomes of the bishops and most necessitous of the inferior clergy. . . . All that is proposed is, to make personal application to such friends of episcopacy as may be supposed willing to contribute. The money thus subscribed to be vested in trustees chosen by the contributors, and by them laid out in government securities, or on mortgages on landed estates. The interest to be under the management of the trustees, and to be by them divided into such annual stipends as the extent of the fund and the exigencies of the case shall require¹."

THE LONDON COMMITTEE, that had been so active and beneficial in the repeal case, again met together, and were indefatigable in procuring subscriptions. Yet, after every exertion in both countries, the amount of collections only enabled the trustees to distribute £100 per annum to the bishop of Edinburgh, £60 per annum to the Primus, and £50 per annum to each of the other bishops ; £15 to a very few, and £10 to some others of the most necessitous clergy. The benevolent originator of this fund, however, did not live to see it in operation. Sir William Forbes and bishop Horsley both died in the end of this year ; and their deaths were lamented as decidedly a "calamity and affliction" to the church.

1807-8.—THE ONLY EVENT of importance in the former year was the death of old Mr. Skinner, the father of the bishop of Aberdeen, and whose sufferings have already been recorded. At the early age of forty-seven, the Right Rev. Jonathan Watson, bishop of Dunkeld, fell into such ill-health as to cause his

¹ Annals, Appendix, 555-560.

leath, "from as complete prostration of strength, and as much bodily imbecility, as if he had reached that period of human life when all is labour and sorrow." Bishop Watson was a native of Banffshire; and, like most of his contemporaries of the diocese of Aberdeen, he had been trained to the ministry by Mr. Skinner of Longside. He was a diligent and successful student, and his classical and theological acquirements did honour to his venerable instructor. So great were then the necessities of the church, that he was promoted to the bishopate at the age of thirty-one; but "this excellent man's deportment was marked by something so decorous in society, and by a mien, a voice, and manner, so attractive in the immediate discharge of his sacred office, as to command the respect of all who knew him, or who witnessed the performance of his official duties; and as he lived universally esteemed, he was universally regretted¹." He had been presented to the church in Laurencekirk in 1791 by lord Gardenston, who built and liberally endowed it. In the year 1790, his lordship informed lord Thurlow, "though bred a presbyterian, I have ever revered the order and decency of the episcopal church. In doctrine they are soundly protestant. Their principles in regard to government are now reformed, and not less loyal than ours. I am so convinced that this measure [the repeal of the penal statutes] will be a public good, that I have resolved to endow and establish, at my private expense, an episcopal chapel in my village of Laurencekirk²." He did accordingly burthen his estate with forty pounds per annum, payable in money, and forty bolls of oatmeal. He likewise built and conveyed to the incumbent a comfortable parsonage with a garden, and three acres of the best land in the vicinity of the village. Soon after his lordship's death, his son sold the estate of Johnston, and the purchaser entered a suit in the Court of Session in order to reduce this endowment; but the court confirmed the deed of perpetual endowment, and declared it to be as valid and lasting as lord Gardenston intended, and as the law could make it.

As soon as respect for the bishop of Dunkeld's memory permitted, the primus issued a mandate to the clergy of the diocese of Dunkeld to meet at the village of Alyth in Perthshire, for the purpose of electing a successor. Some of the clergy intended to have voted for Dr. Gleig, of Stirling; but he immediately requested his friends to concur with those intending

¹ Annals, 468-9.² Ibid. 147.

to vote for the Rev. Patrick Torry, of Peterhead. Mr. was, therefore, unanimously elected, and the deed was mitted to bishop Skinner, at the time when bishop Macfarlane was in Aberdeen, on his road to Oxford with his son, who was then studying at that university. Taking advantage of the circumstance, the primus requested bishop Jolly to come to Aberdeen forthwith along with Mr. Torry; and the consecration of the latter took place in St. Andrew's church on the morrow of Old Michaelmas-day, the 12th of October. Bishop Skinner, assisted by bishops Macfarlane and Jolly, and he was at the same time canonically appointed to the vacant see of Dunkeld¹.

IN CONSEQUENCE of the advanced age, and consequential imbecility, of Mr. Strachan, bishop of Brechin, the bishop of that diocese applied to the primus for a mandate to elect a successor. This was accordingly issued, and the clergy of that diocese met at Montrose on the 27th of September, and unanimously elected Dr. Gleig, and intimated the same to the primus in the usual form. In the preceding year some necessary alarm had been created in the minds of the Episcopal clergy, by the announcement, in a note to the bishop of Aberdeen's charge to his clergy, of his son's intention to publish "a new edition of the Scotch Communion Office, with a prefatory discourse on the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, laid down in that office." No controversy followed; much correspondence took place on the subject, and the primus entertained fears that the Scottish office might be entirely laid aside, as the accredited formulary of the church. The primus, therefore, thought it prudent to ascertain the sentiments of the bishop elect of Brechin upon this subject. Bishop Torry had voluntarily made the following declaration, a copy of which was forwarded to Dr. Gleig, in his signature:—"I, the undersigned, do hereby voluntarily *ex animo* declare, being now about to be promoted by the mercy of God to a seat in the episcopal college of the church of Scotland, that when promoted to the episcopate I will operate with my colleagues in supporting a steady adherence to the truths and doctrines by which our church has been happily distinguished, and particularly to the doctrine of the holy eucharist, as laid down in our excellent communion book, the use of which I will strenuously recommend by my practice, and by every other means in my power. In testi-

¹ Annals, 471-474; Appendix, 537.

whereof, I have signed this declaration at Aberdeen, on the 12th day of October, in the year of our Lord, 1808, as witness my hand.
(Signed) PAT. TORRY."

HAVING NOW, says the primus, "such a plain rule before us, and so satisfactory a precedent for our future proceedings, I am determined, with God's help, to abide by it, in any future promotion, at least for a Scottish ordained presbyter, that may take place in our church." To this the elect of Brechin replied, on the 17th of October—"The condition which you propose binds me to nothing but what I have uniformly practised ever since I was a clergyman, and what I should be strongly inclined to practise were my excellent diocesan [bishop Sandford] to forbid me to do so; for I am as much attached to the Scottish communion office as you, right rev. sir, can be, and, I have reason to think, on the very same principles . . . I am, therefore, perfectly ready to subscribe and deliver to you a declaration, similar to that which has been delivered to you by bishop Torry." Dr. Gleig's letter having been deemed satisfactory, he was consecrated in St. Andrews' church, Aberdeen, on Sunday, October the 30th, by bishop Skinner, the primus, assisted by bishops Jolly, of Moray, and Torry, of Dunkeld; and he was immediately appointed to the bishoprick of Brechin. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Heneage Horsley, incumbent of St. Paul's church, Dundee, and prebendary of St. Asaph's, who, he said, "sought this happy opportunity of delivering the sentiments of bishop Horsley (by the mouth of his son), regarding the nature of the episcopal functions, and of the conduct of those clergy who, though especially ordained, choose to officiate in contempt of the episcopal authority¹."

1809.—BISHOP ABERNETHY DRUMMOND, of Glasgow, died at his house of Hawthornden, on the 27th of August, in his eighty-ninth year. He was descended from the family of Abernethy of Saltoun, in the county of Banff; but having married Miss Drummond, heiress of Hawthornden, near Edinburgh, he added her surname to his own. In the prospect of bishop Sandford's promotion to the episcopate, he resigned the diocese of Edinburgh; but he retained those of Glasgow and Galloway, and at his death these two dioceses were placed under the administration of bishop Sandford. He was a learned man, and was much engaged in controversial writing; but it is said, his frame of mind was "ill suited to the useful adaptation of that knowledge to time, place, and circumstances:

¹ Annals, 477-79.

hence his addresses, whether from the press or from the pulpit, failed, for the most part, to produce the effects which the good, the zealous, and the benevolent bishop himself uniformly wished them to produce."

GEORGE III. entered this year into the fiftieth year of his reign, and the privy council issued an order, on the 27th of September, to the bishops of the church of Scotland, to offer up prayers and thanksgivings to the throne of God, for the protection afforded the king's majesty during a long and arduous reign. Mr. Skinner is of opinion that this was the first occasion on which orders in council assumed the form now always used, of distinguishing and recognising the church of Scotland, from the establishment. With this the church most readily and loyally complied; and besides, the bishops and clergy approached the throne with a dutiful and loyal address, and congratulated his majesty on the auspicious event. In the course of this year, the rev. William Smith, of Musselburgh, and his congregation, were admitted members of the church.

1810.—BISHOP STRACHAN died, at his residence in Dundee, on the 28th of January, at a very advanced age. He was descended from sir James Stratheyhan, who obtained the lands of Thornton, in Kincardineshire, as a dowry with his wife, Agnetta Quagie, an heiress, in which he was confirmed by David I., about the year 1153. His descendant, Andrew Strachan, was created a baronet by Charles I. in 1625, whose son, sir Alexander, dying without issue, the title and estate devolved on the rev. James Strachan, minister of Keith, who was succeeded by his son, sir Francis, a jesuit, who dying without legitimate issue, the title and property devolved upon sir John Strachan, a post-captain in the navy. Sir John dying in 1777, the title and property devolved upon his nephew, admiral sir Richard John Strachan¹. Mr. Skinner says—"this worthy bishop looked for success in his ministry and episcopate, to a respectable exterior, and to the winning arts of affability, courtesy, and gentlemanly address²."

IN THE COURSE of the primary visitation of his diocese, the bishop of Brechin delivered a charge to his clergy, which was published at their desire. In this charge he adverted to the great importance of "rightly dividing the word of truth," and observed at the same time, that "this cannot be done by any one who has not himself a clear and comprehensive view of the great scheme of christianity, considered as a

¹ Burke's Peerage and Baronetage, &c. 592.

² Annals, 481.

hole." In the course of the charge he also made some allusions to the practice of the primus and some of his clergy, of not adhering strictly to the exact words of the liturgy. This produced a correspondence betwixt the bishop of Brechin and the primus, who seems evidently displeased at what he considered an interference with his christian liberty. His son, the author of the Annals, took part in this controversy, and recommended the assembling of a synod in order to settle the matter; to which, although reluctantly, the primus consented.

1811.—ALTHOUGH at first averse to a convocation, and to the object for which it was proposed to be summoned, yet, as was truly said of him by one of his successors in the primacy, he was willing to yield, "for the sake of peace and union, many particular views which he might have retained without reproach." As a preliminary step, he corresponded with all his brethren in the episcopate, and obtained their hearty concurrence to the convocation of a synod, for the purpose of drawing up a code of canons for the regulation of the whole church, of which he was the chief governor. It was decided that the synod should be composed of bishops, deans, and a representative from the clergy of each diocese, as more convenient and manageable than an assembly of the whole of the clergy. Circulars were issued by each of the bishops, requiring their clergy to meet and to elect one of their own body, to represent them in the ensuing national synod, and to give their representatives such instructions as they might think suitable to this very important and solemn occasion. The synod met at Aberdeen on Wednesday, June the 4th, and the primus took the chair *ex officio*, and opened the synod with a solemn prayer, that "God would be graciously pleased to sanctify with His blessing the work for which His commissioned servants were now assembled in His holy presence; and that He would make His unerring word the guide of all their proceedings, and the gracious influence of His enlightening Spirit their never-failing source of support and direction."

AFTER AN OFFER to resign the primacy, which was not accepted, the business of the synod commenced by the primate declaring "this ecclesiastical assembly, which has been duly constituted in the name of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and sanctified by solemn prayer, to be a regular national synod of the episcopal church in Scotland, called for the purpose of establishing a code of canonical regulations suited to the peculiar situation of this church; and that as, by the blessing of God, may tend to preserve within

its venerable pale all the good effects of apostolical order, and of sound and salutary discipline. To which end may He, who is King and Head over all things to his church, be graciously pleased so to unite our hearts, direct our thoughts, and sanctify and bless our deliberations, 'to the use of edifying,' that by promoting, as much as in us lies, the peace, the order, and the unity of the episcopal church in this land, we may be the humble instruments of advancing the honour of our Redeemer's name and his word, and thereby of giving 'Glory to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.'"

THE COMMISSIONS of the deans and representatives were strictly examined; after which they were allowed to reason and debate, to propose and to give their opinions freely, on all those matters of discipline and canonical regulation which were to come under consideration of the synod, but not to give any such decisive voice as bishops only have a right to pronounce. For that purpose they retired to another apartment, and chose the very reverend James Walker, dean of Edinburgh, as their prolocutor, and the REVEREND WILLIAM SKINNER, of Aberdeen, as their clerk. The primus had prepared a Preamble, which was read and approved, and it still continues to preface the canons, although they have since undergone three revisions. The members of the second chamber always took their seats in the upper chamber, when a canon was proposed; after which they retired to their own chamber, to pass their judgment upon both the language and the subject matter of it, and then their prolocutor stated their sentiments to the chamber of bishops; and when any canon was passed into a law, the members of the second chamber took their seats in the upper one.

THE SIXTEENTH CANON prohibits any alterations or insertions to be made in the morning and evening services of the liturgy; but the officiating ministers are bound to use the exact words. It is a remarkable but a very satisfactory fact, that the fifteenth canon, (but which is now the twenty-first of the revised canons of 1838), was actually framed by two clergymen of the church of England, and who were dignitaries in that church, the rev. A. Alison, prebendary of Sarum, representative of the diocese of Edinburgh, and the rev. H. Horsley, prebendary of St. Asaph, who sat for the diocese of Brechin¹. This is the canon which has recently excited so much controversy, and

¹ Annals, 516.

which has been made the pretence for a new independent schism in that church, because it declared the Scottish communion office to be of "PRIMARY AUTHORITY." When the church received the independent congregations into her communion, "she had no thought of altering the character or position of her sacramental liturgy. She made a *concession* to others, with which *they* were satisfied, remaining herself *unchanged*; the authority was on her side, and consequently on the side of the office she used: it was the office of the church in Scotland, the other was the office of certain *congregations* of that church. This was felt to be the relative position of the parties when the facts of the case came to be dealt with in synod. The framers of the canon, who happened to be dignitaries of the church of England, asserted the *authority* of the Scottish office, while the privilege of using the English in all congregations where it had been *previously* in use, was ratified and confirmed. It was impossible that it could have been expressed otherwise, unless it had been determined that the church should recede from the position she had struggled to maintain, and cease to bear her witness to the high sacramental doctrines embodied in her office. This the bishops of that day, I am convinced, would have resisted to the last; some of them, I know, would have parted with life much sooner than have done an act tending to obscure or extinguish the testimony which had once been borne to the truth. But the ministers of the church of England, with whom they had to deal, demanded of them no sacrifice so unreasonable; they were satisfied with securing for themselves the office which their own predilections, or the prejudices of their flocks, had rendered most acceptable, without envying the pre-eminence bestowed upon another, or denouncing as erroneous the doctrines of a church to whose bishops they had promised canonical obedience¹."

THIS SYNOD sat two days, the 19th and 20th of June, and at their rising the primus was requested to send a copy of the canons to each of the archbishops and bishops of the united church of England and Ireland. This he complied with on the 11th of September, accompanied with a circular letter to each. And now, says Mr. Skinner, "the above necessary and important work of framing, enacting, and promulgating a code of canons for the episcopal church in Scotland being accomplished, and pastors and people happily furnished with articles of faith and rules of discipline, accordant in every re

¹ Cheyne's Vindication, 41.

spect with scriptural authority and primitive usage, bishop Skinner's anxious mind enjoyed a solace, a relief, and satisfaction, which the world can neither give nor take away; but of which those only are capable of partaking, the supreme desire of whose heart it is to do God and His church service, and who, like the late Scottish primus, having through life endeavoured to make full proof of their ministry, are permitted to feel that He who is head over all things to His church 'has prospered the work of their hands¹.'

1812.—THE HISTORY of the establishment from the Union, when it was firmly secured, is very uninteresting; after so much excitement and malignant activity against the church, the kirk seems to have settled down into the repose of "moderation." The Assembly met this year, on the 21st of May, and lord Napier was sent down by the Prince Regent as commissioner, and William Macmorine was chosen moderator. In their address to the regent, they lamented the long-continued and severe malady with which it had pleased God to visit the king, whose virtues they revered, and were happy under his government². Mr. Ferrie, professor of civil history in St. Andrews, had been presented to the parish of Kilconquhar, in the county of Fife; but the presbytery of St. Andrews refused to induct him, unless he would resign his chair in the university. He declined to resign, and appealed from the presbytery's decision to the next assembly³.

1813.—LORD NAPIER again appeared as the representative of the head of the kirk, and Andrew Brown was chosen moderator. Mr. Ferrie's appeal was brought up, and after a very long and animated debate, the sentence of the presbytery was reversed in a very full house by a majority of only five. This was a recognition of the union of offices and non-residence, against both of which the kirk has ever been hostile; but this is attributed to the reign of moderation. The Assembly drew up, and forwarded, a petition against the popish claims, which were then in agitation.

1814-15.—LORD NAPIER again met the Assembly on the 19th of May, as the royal commissioner. In his letter the prince assured them that "a new era is arrived; our constitution and independence are no longer assailed by the domineering usurpation of tyrannical ambition; our establishments are unimpaired; our laws remain entire; and our religion is preserved." In return, the Assembly "rejoiced in the arrival of a new era, and in having been permitted to unite their

¹ Annals, 519, 520.

² Acts of Assembly, 929.

³ Hetherington, 232.

ble exertions with those of his majesty's other faithful acts, in working out the good work of peace." After a discussion, a *Declaratory Act* was passed, pronouncing the law inconsistent with the constitution and the fundamental principles of the church of Scotland, for any minister to hold an office which necessarily required his absence from his parish, and subjected him to an authority that the presbytery of which he was a member could not control. An attempt was made, by the moderates, to repeal this law in the Assembly of 1792, on the ground that as it was in reality a *new* law it should, therefore, to have been subject to the provisions of the former Act, and sent down to the presbyteries for their consideration. This was resisted by the other party.

16.—THE ASSEMBLY met on the 16th of May, lord Napier appearing as the representative of the head *de facto* of the church. The somnolency of moderatism was now beginning to lose its repose broken by the activity and agitation of the Calvinistic or evangelical party, as they styled themselves. They asserted that the Assembly had violated the rights of the presbyteries; and they insisted upon the repeal of the non-residence Act, and that an overture should be transmitted to the presbyteries for that purpose. Dr. Hill, therefore, proposed one similar to the Declaratory Act, which the Assembly sent down to the presbyteries¹.

FROM THE TIME that the last synod was held, to this time, the ordinary routine of ecclesiastical affairs proceeded without there being any event of sufficient importance to be placed on record. The primacy of one of the greatest prelates of the church of Scotland has produced since the Revolution was drawing to a close. The last act of his administration was to put into the post-office, with his own hand, before his death, a congratulatory address to the prince of Wales, on the marriage of his daughter, the princess Charlotte—little aware of what a day might bring forth. He died the following day, the 13th of July.

THE PRIMACY of bishop John Skinner commenced at the time when the church was at its lowest point of depression. Penal laws were still on the statute-book unrepealed, and they have been carried into effect upon the malicious instigation of any enemy. Happily for the church, bishop Skinner was elevated to the primacy in the strength and vigour of age, when only in his 44th year. With the exception of bishop Macfarlane, he was the youngest of his brethren,

¹ Acts of Assembly.—Hetherington's History, 232.

who, in addition to the natural caution and timidity of age, had the fear of imprisonment and banishment for life, to serve as slaves in the colonies, before their eyes. From them he had little support or counsel to expect; and as to the inferior clergy, the bishop of St. Andrews, in a private letter, writes—that “there was no small difficulty in those days in obtaining candidates for the ministry, the encouragement being so little, and the obstacles discouraging, unless when surmounted by high principle and devotedness to the cause. The ministers of the establishment were *then*, as they are *now*, individually courteous enough, but hostile in their corporate capacity.” The primate’s annalist says of the inferior clergy—“He beheld a class of men justly commendable for their passive virtues, for their inoffensive and exemplary moral deportment, and for their *meek endurance of a life of poverty, neglect, and not unfrequent SCORN!* but men, with very few exceptions, unskilled in every other art but the art of suffering for conscience sake, and therefore unfit to contribute to the rescue of themselves and of the church in which they served,—from the pains and penalties of law, and from the obloquy which attended them. Or, did the bishop direct his view to the laity of the episcopal communion in Scotland? he saw considerations of state policy constraining the class of landed proprietors, whether peers or commoners, and nearly all of the episcopal persuasion in public stations, *to turn their backs upon* the altar of their native church, that they might support the throne of their native land. He saw many of the youth of both sexes ashamed of being seen in the place of worship, nicknamed the ‘non-jurant meeting-house,’ and frequented only by their pious grandmothers; and, in the southern districts of Scotland, more especially, he saw the labouring class of episcopalians fast withdrawing themselves from the church of their fathers, by reason of their ignorance of any other distinction but the hitherto ostensible distinction of non-submission to the House of Brunswick¹.”

No WONDER, therefore, that this christian hero stood appalled at such a prospect; nevertheless, in the fear of God, and with a firm reliance on the divine promise to protect His church, single-handed he undertook the Herculean task of delivering her from persecution and bondage, and of uniting her scattered and hostile members. We have seen how wisely and judiciously he accomplished both these apparent impossibilities; God working for him and with him—for with God nothing is

¹ Annals, 520, 521.

impossible ;—and that at his death he saw the blessed effects of his indefatigable labours, in an extended and flourishing church. It is true, the political schism was not entirely reconciled at his death ; it is not closed yet, and it has causelessly broken out afresh ; but he saw it in a fair way of being entirely healed, and it might have been closed, had not the evil passions of men stood as a lion in the way, to widen and re-open the breach. He at least acquitted his own soul ; it is the business of the schismatics to look to theirs. But when the deeds done in the body are passed in review, it will not be the hollow pretext of keeping communion with a church *that absolutely disclaims them*, that will excuse their rending the body of Christ, under pretence of greater purity, but in reality to be entirely *free from all restraint* upon their own private judgment and their love of pre-eminence. The reformed Catholic church of Scotland offers no sinful terms of communion ; for she is in full communion with that very church whose name they assume as a cloak for their hypocrisy and iniquity. From the obeyance of her Convocation, the Church of England has it not in her power corporately to disclaim the schismatics ; but every one of her bishops, without an exception, at the time of the union, washed their hands of them, branded them with the sin of wilful and obstinate schism, and the present bishop of London, Dr. Blomfield, has in the year 1844 *wholly disclaimed them*. The bishop being the church, and the church in the bishop, it follows, that the oft repeated disclaimers, of all the English bishops, must make it sufficiently evident that these congregations form no part of the Church of England, but are independent schismatics, of the worst description, *pride and vain-glory* being the foundation of their sinful separation. When the mighty God of Jacob had delivered His church from Egyptian bondage, and brought her into the land of Canaan, He still allowed some of the wretched inhabitants to remain, that they might be pricks in the eyes, and thorns in the sides of the true Israelites, to *vex* them. This is precisely the case with the Scottish branch of His church ; it is *vexed* with these separatists that remained disunited. The church here has also another source of vexation, in what might at first sight appear very desirable, and even a blessing ; but it is a source of weakness, that is partly the church's own fault. When Presbyterians wish to be added to the church, they think no other mode of admission necessary than to take a kneeling, or pew, in one of the episcopal churches, and hear sermons. They never think that the only way of admission to the church is through the gate of holy baptism, and that it is their *highest*

privilege to be so admitted. The clergy take no pains to instruct them in this point, fearing the charge of bigotry and illiberality. That species of converts bring into the church all their presbyterian prejudices, predilections, and insubordination, and they cannot be persuaded that there is any distinctive marks of difference betwixt the church and presbyterianism, but only in the *mode* of worship. Of this sort of converts the schismatical meeting is composed which was recently opened in Edinburgh, in defiance of the bishop of that see. At the time when that schism took place, one of the circulars was audaciously sent to the bishop of Ross and Argyle, who informed me that in the list of subscribers there was not one who was a *bona fide* episcopalian. This fact alone might convince the clergy of the *christian duty* and necessity of preaching to the old, and of catechising the young, on *the marks of the church*; of the real difference that exists betwixt the church and presbyterianism, and on the sinfulness of schism, even although it might be at the risk of *offending* some that might go back and walk no more with them.

BISHOP SKINNER was instrumental in working the greatest change in the outward circumstances of the Scottish church; which, from a state of obscurity and depression, unknown in the annals of any other regular branch of the church of Christ, rose, under his fostering hand, to a state of respectability and distinction not enjoyed by any other merely tolerated church. The preacher of his funeral sermon, says—"Should it be enquired how a single individual could have been so instrumental, as bishop Skinner is known to have been, in effecting this auspicious change on the face of Scottish episcopacy? without arrogating a tittle of merit to himself, it was thus that this humble-minded servant of the humble Jesus accounted for his good success:—'the consecration of bishop Seabury for the State of Connecticut, in North America, first introduced me to the knowledge and acquaintance of some eminent divines of the church of England. They were the men who thenceforth interested themselves so much in the repeal of the penal statutes, and in the grievously depressed situation of our church, that, for my own part, I had only to inform them and some invaluable and equally zealous lay friends, what my venerable colleagues and I wished to be done, and they did it! Would the man ambitious of worldly fame have thus meekly relinquished his prize? Would the lover of personal distinction more than a lover of God have thus voluntarily denuded himself of all distinction, and, self-divested as he was, have chosen to attribute to others that good work which his excel-

lent co-operators hesitate not to acknowledge was, under God, effected by his own unwearied labours,—his own sleepless nights and thoughtful days?”

LIKE MOST public benefactors, bishop Skinner was not without enemies, who called his patriotism, and his inestimable services to the church, ambition, and the love of dominion. No estimate could have been more unfounded, as few men more completely sank self in the pursuit of that which was nearest to his heart—the restoration and relief of the church. Bishop Walker, who knew him well, and was well able to judge and appreciate his character, says of him, in a letter to his son,—“The late Primus was considered by those who were *prejudiced against*, and did not know him, as narrow-minded, harsh, and bigotted. I can testify distinctly, and I feel great pleasure in testifying, that in all my intercourse with him, (though we often differed very materially in opinion), those prejudices were very *unjust*; and that he is fully entitled, by a reference to the great facts of his administration, (while I was best acquainted with him), to the reputation of *a good and candid man*, who was willing to yield, for the sake of peace and union, many particular views which he might have retained without reproach. I need not remind you of the very important synod held at Aberdeen in 1811, of which you were a member. I recollect that period with serious satisfaction, and I know that your father’s conduct on that occasion made a deep impression on those clergy who previously knew him very partially, and only by hearsay. His kind and easy hospitality as our landlord; the ability and accuracy with which he prepared the matter of our deliberations; his impartial conduct as president of our Assembly; and the readiness with which he yielded those points, which we, from the south, thought most necessary for general conciliation,—stand strongly in my recollection, and are certainly worthy of special consideration in the estimate of your father’s character.”

DURING TWENTY-SIX years of his episcopate, bishop Skinner enjoyed the powerful support, counsel, and advice of his father, and he never attempted to conceal, “that in all his measures for the church’s relief and prosperity (the late synod excepted), he was, under God, more indebted to the head, the heart, and the hand of his own father, the venerable pastor of Longside, Aberdeenshire, than to any other fellow-labourer in his Great Master’s vineyard.”

CHAPTER LXXIX.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND GEORGE GLEIG, LL.D
BISHOP OF BRECHIN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1816.—Funeral of the late primus.—Casual meeting of the clergy.—Meeting at Turriff—of the bishops at Aberdeen—election of the primus.—Diocesan synod—election of Dr. Skinner—and consecration.—1817.—General Assembly.—Professors in universities.—Rev. James Walker.—Rome—English service there.—1818.—General Assembly.—1819.—Death of bishop Macfarlane.—Election of Dr. Low—his consecration.—1820.—Death of the duke of Kent—and of George III.—An independent congregation united to the church.—Introduction of low Calvinistic doctrines.—General Assembly.—An act.—1821.—Christian Knowledge Society.—1822.—New church erected.—George Fourth's visit—the bishops' address—king's reply.—St. Paul's Chapel, Aberdeen.—District committee for the Christian Knowledge Society.—1823.—Bishop Sandford's sermon.—1824.—General Assembly.—Pluralities.—1825.—General Assembly.—English chapel in Rome.—Dr. Luscombe—correspondence with the Scottish prelates—his consecration—his object—his reception in France.—1826-27.—General Assembly—address on the duke of York's death—union of offices.—1828.—Canons of 1811.—Convocation at Laurencekirk.—1829.—General Assembly.—Mission to India.—The canons.—The popish plot.—Difficulty with the king.—Clause of the king's speech.—Mr. Peel resigns his seat for Oxford.—Members' oaths.—Extract from the bishop of Salisbury—from Mr. Faber.—Petitions.—Bill passed the Commons—opposition in the House of Lords—archbishop of Armagh's speech—bill carried—perjury.—Bishop of Salisbury's letter to the duke of Wellington.—Remarks on the king's visit—on the protestant chapel in Rome—and in Paris.

1816.—ALL THE CLERGY within a certain distance were invited to attend the late primate's funeral, after which they casually met together, when Mr. Innes, of Micklefolla, made a proposition to his brethren, which was seconded by Mr. Annan, of St. John's, Aberdeen, that they should put the Rev. H. Horsley,

**TO NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY**

**ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS**



of Dundee, in nomination as the successor of their late diocesan. Some present being desirous of having a resident bishop, proposed Dr. Torry, the present bishop of St. Andrews, but nothing conclusive was decided on. Soon after, however, Mr. Innes requested his brethren to meet at Turriff, with the view of resolving for whom they should vote when they received authority for that purpose. The chief objection to Mr. Horsley was, his being non-resident, and the fears that he might attempt to introduce the English communion office into the diocese; whereas bishop Torry was resident within the diocese, and was every way unexceptionable. The Rev. Mr. Cay, of Cruden, in conclusion, proposed the son of their late bishop, one of their own number, and who besides was resident in the diocese; this proposal was warmly responded to by the majority of this unauthorised meeting, which separated, however, without having come to any resolution. Bishop Jolly, as the senior bishop, summoned a meeting of the surviving bishops at Aberdeen in August, when they elected Dr. Gleig, bishop of Brechin, to be the primus of the church. He immediately granted a mandate to the dean, the very rev. — Sangster, of Lonmay, and clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen, to elect a bishop for their diocese. The clergy were accordingly convoked at Ellon on the 11th of September, where the dean proposed the Rev. William Skinner, of St. Andrew's Church, Aberdeen, and asked if any clergyman present had any other candidate to propose; Mr. Innes, who was seconded by Mr. Annan, proposed the Rev. H. Horsley, of Dundee, as a fit and proper person to be elected. When put to the vote, Dr. Skinner was elected by a large majority, and a regular instrument was drawn up, signed by the dean and the clergy who voted for Dr. Skinner, and forwarded to the primate. Bishop Gleig sent a severe reproof to the dean and clergy of Aberdeen, for electing *the son* of their late bishop, as it was, he said, contrary to a clause in the apostolical constitutions, which forbade the election of the son of a preceding bishop. This objection arose more from the private opinions of the primus, than from any reasonable cause, and his solitary objection was overruled. Dr. Skinner was consecrated at Stirling on the eve of the festival of St. Simon and St. Jude, the 27th of October, by the right reverend Dr. Gleig, bishop of Brechin and primus, assisted by Dr. Jolly, bishop of Moray, Dr. Sandford, bishop of Edinburgh, and Dr. Torry, bishop of Dunkeld and Dunblane¹.

¹ Private Communications.—Skinner's Annals, 36, 37.—Perceval's Apology p. 256.

1817.—THE EARL OF ERROL was sent down as royal commissioner to the General Assembly, which met on the 22d of May, and Mr. Gavin Gibb was elected moderator. The overture formerly mentioned was returned with the consent of the majority of the presbyteries; and therefore it was passed into a law, that professors in universities cannot hold livings that are not situate in the city which is the seat of the university. It was enacted and ordained, “that if a professor in an university be hereafter presented to a parochial charge which is not situated in the city that is the seat of that university, or in the suburbs thereof, he shall, within nine months after his being admitted to the said charge, resign his professorship, and at the next ordinary meeting of presbytery thereafter shall produce a certificate that his resignation has been accepted. And that if the minister of a parish which is not situated, &c. be hereafter presented, or elected, to a professorship in any university, he shall, at the first ordinary meeting of presbytery which shall take place after the lapse of six months from the date of his induction into the professorship, resign into the hands of the presbytery his parochial charge¹.”

AS IN SOME DEGREE connected with the church of Scotland, it may be mentioned, that in this year the Rev. James Walker, of St. Peter's chapel, Edinburgh, arrived in Rome on the 11th of November, and seeing, with regret, his countrymen “wandering like sheep without a shepherd, and sauntering, from mere vacant curiosity, from church to church, and from sight to sight,” he resolved to have regular worship in the eternal city during that winter, for the benefit of the British subjects residing there. A house, therefore, was hired, and converted into a temporary chapel, and he began to officiate to a crowded and respectable audience on the 30th of November, being the first Sunday in Advent. “It was proposed,” he says, “to make a direct application to the Pope for permission; but this was very properly checked; for the slightest reflection proved to us that such an application could not be successful, and would even force the government to stop our proceedings. Our service, however, was quite as public and as well known to every individual in Rome, as any the most noted ceremony or service of their own; and we were well assured that the Pope [Pius VII.] and his ministers, were not only disposed to wink at our proceedings, but that they were even gratified by the decorous and unostentatious manner in which we stu-

¹ Acts of Assembly, Sess. vi. p. 959.

died to conduct them. It was obvious, from the first, that our object was not to give offence, nor to make proselytes, but to furnish the means of religious worship to our own countrymen. . . . I feel the sincerest gratification when I reflect on the regularity and devout attention of our countrymen, of all ranks and professions, who were that winter in Rome. We had neither a commodious place, nor vestments, nor ceremony, nor music, nor eloquence, to attract; but I never saw a more regular and attentive audience; and it really seemed as if our simple forms and spiritual worship had more than their usual influence and attraction in that metropolis of papal pomp. The holy communion was devoutly administered on Christmas-day to upwards of forty, and again on the Sunday following to nearly a hundred. . . . The expense of our little establishment was defrayed by contribution, which was limited to a Roman crown per head, or family. There were two contributions at that rate during the winter; the residue, after defraying rent and incidental expenses, being destined, together with the offertories, for the poor of Rome. The offertories at the communion were liberal, and were employed, with every possible attention and delicacy, to alleviate the distress of numerous individuals, many of whom had seen better days¹."

1818.—THE EARL OF ERROL again represented the sovereign in the Assembly of 1818. The Assembly sent an address of condolence to the prince regent, on the death of the princess of Saxe Coburg; and made an overture and interim act for the more effectual prevention of simony. "This overture was transmitted for four years, but not passed²."

1819.—THE RIGHT REV. ANDREW MACFARLANE, bishop of Ross and Argyle, died at Inverness, at a very advanced age, and in the thirty-second year of his episcopate. He had been for some time in a state of mental imbecility, and was unfit for the duties of his office for several years before his death. The primate issued a mandate to the clergy of that district to meet at Inverness and elect a suitable person to be his successor. Their choice was wisely directed to the rev. David Low, LL.D. incumbent of a small chapel at Pittenweem, in the county of Fife, then in the vigour of life, active, zealous, and indefatigable. Dr. Low was consecrated at Stirling on the 14th November, by Dr. Gleig, bishop of Brechin, primus,

¹ Letters from Rome; in Scottish Episcopal Magazine. Letter I. i. 27.

² Acts of Assembly, Sess. 9, p. 965.

assisted by Dr. Jolly, bishop of Moray, and Dr. Torry, bishop of Dunkeld; and he was immediately appointed to the bishoprick of Ross and Argyle¹. Dr. Walker, of St. Peters, Edinburgh, preached on this occasion, on "the kingdom which is not of this world." This subject is one of great intrinsic interest, and Dr. Walker illustrates it with singular felicity and eloquence in this sermon, which bears the token of much thought and of the study of years. The primus visited his diocese this year, and delivered a charge to his clergy, which, at their request, was afterwards published. He stated, that "the principles of our holy religion are not a collection of independent truths," but that "they must be studied in regular order, and communicated to our people in the same order, if we would guard ourselves and them from the cunning craftiness of men, who everywhere lie in wait to deceive." On St. Patrick's day, the 17th of March, a committee was formed, and a connection was established with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge at Aberdeen, for the purpose of supplying the poor with Bibles, Testaments, Prayer Books, &c. at the society's reduced prices. A set of rules were drawn up and approved of, by Dr. Gaskin, and they elected certain office-bearers, and appointed bishops Jolly, Torry, Skinner, and Low, vice-presidents².

1820.—ON THE 23d of January his royal highness prince Edward, duke of Kent and Strathearn, died at Woodbrook Cottage, near Sidmouth, in the fifty-third year of his age, from inflammation brought on by sitting in damp boots. He was the fourth son of king George III.; he married, in 1818, the dowager duchess of Leinengen, daughter of the duke of Saxe Coburg Saalfeld, and left one daughter, now our most gracious sovereign lady queen Victoria. On the 29th of January the good old king George III. died at Windsor, in the eighty-second year of his age and the sixtieth of his reign, which was the longest in the annals of Great Britain, and distinguished by events that were never surpassed in the history of the world. "He mounted the throne," says the late bishop Walker, "in the prime and brilliancy of youth, the first native prince of his house; firm in his character, correct in his conduct, conciliating in his manners, constitutional in his government, and equally beloved and respected in every period of his reign. The glories and the blessings of his reign exceed, beyond all comparison, the disasters and the inconve-

¹ Perceval's Apology, 256.

² Scottish Episcopal Magazine, iii. 149-151.

iences from which the history of nations and the progress of society are never wholly exempted ; and to those glories and blessings, the firm character, the correct conduct, and the conciliating manners of the king, very essentially contributed. His religious and moral character shed something like a sacred lustre round the clouds under which his sun hovered for a series of years, to its setting. His reverence for religion, and his regard for the church, of which he was the temporal head (without infringing the rights of any other church or the claims of genuine toleration), were uniform and habitual, and had an influence in the nation which will, I trust, be long remembered with feelings of gratitude, and imitated with sincerity¹."

ANOTHER OF THE independent congregations was added to the church this year, by the death of the rev. George Straiton, minister of the English independent chapel at Brechin, on the 1st of January. The congregation was extremely small, but without attempting to continue the schism by inviting another English clergyman to settle among them, they united with the catholic congregation of which the REV. DAVID MOIR was the minister. On the 15th of February, the university of Glasgow conferred the degree of LL.D. on the REV. MICHAEL RUSSELL, minister of St. James's chapel, Leith²; and the Marischal College, in the university of Aberdeen, conferred, in April, the degree of LL.D. on the right rev. David Low, bishop of Ross and Argyle³.

ABOUT THIS PERIOD the peace of the church was broken up by the introduction of the low Calvinistic doctrines of that which was absurdly called the Evangelical party in the church of England. This was occasioned by the sudden vacancy of St. Paul's chapel, in a steep dirty ally called Carrubbers Close, in the High Street of Edinburgh ; and as the hon. and rev. Gerard Noel happened to be there on a visit, he offered to officiate till some one was appointed to the living. He sought out and procured the appointment of the rev. Edward Craig, who was afterwards a stipendiary curate in Northamptonshire. These two evangelical clergymen commenced and continued an assault upon all the catholic doctrines of the church ; and they introduced such contention and discord both amongst the clergy and laity, as has had the most injurious consequences to the church. Attracted by their popular and anticatholic preaching, a great number of presbyterians became *nominal* members of the church in the way described above ; but in order to hear the

¹ Scottish Episcopal Mag. i. 99.² Ibid. i. 109, 110.³ Ibid. 225.

sermon, they were obliged to *endure* the prayers. In the course of time, consequently, they have become habituated to the church service; nevertheless, for the most part they are only hearers of the word, and still retain their presbyterian prejudices.

THE EARL OF MORTON was sent down this year as commissioner to the Assembly. The unhappy disputes betwixt his majesty George IV. and his royal consort were the cause of some sensitiveness on the part of the kirk respecting their independence. An order in council was issued to regulate the manner of praying for the royal family; it was laid before the Assembly, and they opened their deliberations upon it with the following motion:—"That it be declared by the General Assembly, that *no civil authority* can constitutionally issue either forms or heads of prayer to the ministers and preachers of this church; and that the orders in council which have been issued from time to time, respecting prayers for the royal family, are inconsistent with the rights and privileges secured by law to our ecclesiastical establishment; but that as these orders appear to have originated in mistake or inadvertence, and not in any intention to interfere with our modes of worship, the General Assembly do not consider it necessary to proceed farther in this matter at present¹." This is the old spirit of presbytery, and appears to have been a threat to bully the government, but it was without effect.

1821.—THE REPORT of the committee formed at Aberdeen, in connection with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in the year 1819, gave a very flattering account of its success; and among other things, it says:—"It is not, perhaps, generally known, that in the highlands a very considerable number of episcopalians are to be found, to whom it is necessary to read the church service in Gaelic. For the use of these, the society got the Book of Common Prayer translated into that language; and of this edition, which was placed at the disposal of the committee in Aberdeen, nearly 300 copies have already been sold. A few of their tracts have also been translated; and, in short, the managers of that venerable society seem disposed, so far as it lies in their power, to afford the means of religious instruction to this much neglected portion of our countrymen²."

1822.—THE CHAPELS at Forfar and Meigle, in the diocese of Dunkeld, were in such a dilapidated and discreditable state, that it was found necessary to pull down the Forfar cha-

¹ Acts of Assembly, 979, Note.

² Scottish Episcopal Magazine, iii. 151.

, and to erect, by subscription, a new and handsome edifice, able of accommodating four hundred people¹.

IN THE SUMMER of this year, George IV. paid a visit to ancient kingdom, to the great joy of all classes, of all religious principles, and of all shades of politics. It was amazing in every sense, and it was highly creditable to the working classes of the people, to see them all dressed in their day suits, forming a line on the broad and spacious streets of his northern capital, to see their sovereign pass along in the middle. Their welcomes and cheers were given with the heartiest vociferations, but their conduct was most remarkably decorous and becoming; so much so as to call forth the marked approbation of the king himself. It was impossible to resist the enthusiasm of the time, and the general joy at seeing the king make his appearance familiarly amongst us, as one friend visits another. "He displayed no ensign or token of party, aiming to mortify one class of men, and to afford a paltry triumph to another. He came as the king of Scotland, and not as the patron of whig or tory; and it is delightful to add, that he was received by all orders, and classes and denominations, as their common sovereign. . . . We speak not without warrant, when we state that the king, oftener than once, declared to those around him, that the scene he witnessed between the king of Leith and Holmrood-house, on the day he landed, surpassed greatly, not only all his expectations on that head, but every idea that he could have formed of decorum, decency, and respectful attention, on the part of the populace of a great city²."

THE BISHOPS assembled in Edinburgh, and agreed to an address to the king, to whom so much deference was shewn, so as to have it intimated to them that their address would be received in the royal closet. A deputation was therefore appointed, consisting of the six bishops with six priests, viz. the reverends H. Horsley, John Cruickshanks, Robert Morehead, Archibald Alison, Michael Russell, and James Walker. Mr. Horsley was appointed to read the following address, which majesty received in his closet:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,—We, your majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the bishops and clergy of the Scottish Episcopal church, beg leave humbly to approach your royal presence with expressions of our most heartfelt attachment

¹ Scottish Episcopal Magazine, iii. 153.

² Ibid. 471-2.

and loyalty to your majesty's sacred person and government.

"SO MANY YEARS have passed away since Scotland was honoured by the presence of its sovereign, that, to behold your majesty in the palace of the long line of our ancient monarchs, your majesty's royal ancestors, is to us, as it must be to every true Scotchman, a matter of pride and exultation; and in this house, more especially, do we feel ourselves prompted by these emotions, to declare that, within the wide compass of your majesty's dominions, are no where to be found hearts more loyal than those which beat in the breasts of the Scottish episcopalians.

"THE DEVOTED attachment uniformly displayed by the members of our church to him whom they have considered as their legitimate sovereign, is so well known to your majesty, that it would be waste of time to repeat it here, and is, indeed, amply vouched by the lowly station which we, her bishops, now hold in society. Your majesty likewise knows that our religious principles and forms of worship are the same with those of the church of England, from which, indeed, we twice derived our episcopacy, when it had been lost at home; and whilst we are sincerely grateful for the toleration of these principles, and the free exercise of the rites of our worship, we feel that it is to your majesty's gracious consideration, and that of your royal father, that our gratitude is in a peculiar manner due.

"WE WOULD NOT occupy too much of your majesty's time by protestations of our loyalty, but we must beg leave solemnly to declare, in your royal presence, that viewing in your majesty's sacred person the lineal descendant of the royal family of Scotland, and the legitimate possessor of the British throne, we feel to your majesty that devoted attachment which our principles assure us are due to our rightful sovereign; and that should evil days ever come upon your majesty's house (which may God, in his infinite mercy, avert), the house of Brunswick will find that the Scottish episcopalians are ready to endure for it as much as they have suffered for the house of Stuart, and with heart and hand to convince the world that in their breasts a firm attachment to the religion of their fathers is inseparably connected with unshaken loyalty to their king.

"THAT YOUR MAJESTY may long reign over a happy and united people, to maintain that peace and prosperity which the wisdom of your majesty's councils and the vigour of your arms have, by the providence of God, achieved for them, is

earnest prayer of your majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects.—(Signed) George Gleig, premier-bishop; Alexander Jolly, bishop; Daniel Sandford, bishop; Patrick Torry, bishop; William Skinner, bishop; David Low, bishop."

TO THIS ADDRESS THE KING was graciously pleased to reply,—“ I thank you for this dutiful and loyal address, and I receive with the greatest satisfaction your affectionate congratulations on my arrival in this part of my dominions. I have the fullest confidence in your faithful attachment to my person and government, and you may rely on my protection of the civil and religious liberties of all classes of my subjects¹.”

THIS ADDRESS was received in the royal closet, and each of the deputation had the honour to kiss his majesty's hand. This was an honour which was not conferred on even the established ministers, when they presented their address; and it occasioned some unnecessary jealousy. Its historical allusions, perhaps, may have wounded the sensibilities of the descendants of the presbyterian persecutors; but “one venerable priest is still alive [1822, and was even one of the deputation] who was dragged to the jail of Aberdeen, and paid the penalty of six months imprisonment, for the offence of having performed divine worship before more than four persons. He bore his punishment like a good christian, supported by steady principles; and his attachment to the ancient house of Stuart was only equalled by the warmth and sincerity of the loyalty which he now bears to George IV.; a loyalty which no hopes could bribe or power compel².” His majesty was particularly struck with the venerable and primitive appearance of bishop Jolly, whose reverential deportment in the royal closet was very remarkable.

SOME OF THE independent meeting-houses still stood aloof, and in a hostile attitude to the church; amongst these, the most notorious and inveterate in their prejudices was St. Paul's, in Aberdeen, a collegiate charge, and partially endowed. There was a vacancy in this charge, either by resignation or *dismissal*; and a most respectable English clergyman was offered the vacant pulpit, but he refused to accept it unless the chapel was united to the church, and submitted to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Aberdeen. An union was spoken of, but the pride of independence could not brook the authority of a bishop, under the groundless apprehension that their funds

Scottish Episcopal Magazine, iii. 471-477.

² Note to the above, p. 473.

would be subject to his control; but this interference is expressly guarded against by one of the canons¹.

IN DECEMBER, a district committee for the south and west of Scotland was formed in Edinburgh, after there had been several preliminary meetings, and some correspondence with the parent society, in order to further the general objects of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The primus and the bishop of Edinburgh, with several noblemen and gentlemen, accepted the office of vice-presidents. At a meeting held in St. John's Church, Edinburgh, the marquis of Lothian in the chair, it was resolved that measures should be adopted for raising by donation and subscription such an amount of funds as might appear necessary for defraying contingent expenses, and for establishing a depôt of the Society's books and tracts in Edinburgh².

1823.—ON TUESDAY, THE 21st of January, Dr. Sandford, bishop of Edinburgh, preached a sermon in St. John's Church, in aid of the funds of the Christian Knowledge Society, when a small collection was made. The parent society acknowledged the beneficial effects resulting from the formation of diocesan and district committees; and they anticipated important results, both to the Society and to the cause of religion, from the formation and the exertions of the district committee for the south and west of Scotland³.

1824.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met on the 20th of May; the earl of Morton was the commissioner, and the Rev. George Cook was chosen moderator. The appointment of Dr. Macfarlane, minister of St. Mungo's parish, in the city of Glasgow, to be principal of the university of that city, occasioned the question of pluralities to be again brought before the Assembly. The late act did not prohibit, but allowed, university and parochial preferment to be held by the same person, when, as in this case, they were both situated in the same city. But acts of Assembly will not stop the spirit of faction. This being the first opportunity that had occurred, it was debated in the presbytery of Glasgow; but the appointment was there affirmed by a large majority. It was appealed to the Assembly by the university, and again affirmed⁴.

1825.—THE SAME SUBJECT was again revived in the Assembly of this year, which met on the 18th of May, the lord Forbes being the commissioner, and the Rev. Alexander Brunton, of the Tron Church, Edinburgh, the moderator. A

¹ Scots Episcopal Magazine, iii. 603.

² Ibid. 632-635.

³ Ibid. 635, 636.

⁴ Acts of Assembly.—Hetherington's History, 233.

long debate ensued, which ended in a motion to send overtures to the presbyteries respecting the union of the office of professor and parochial minister in the same person in university towns; when a counter motion was carried by a majority of twenty-six, but chiefly of lay-elders; "and therefore the General Assembly did, and hereby do, judge it inexpedient to transmit any overture to the presbyteries of this church anent the union of offices in the church¹." Upon the intimation of this judgment, Mr. Marshall, in his own name, and in that of all who should adhere to him, entered his dissent.

THERE IS ANOTHER EPISODE in the History of the Church of Scotland which is as remarkable as the consecration of bishop Seabury for the American church. After the great change which the return of permanent peace made in society, and in the relative incomes of individuals, great multitudes resorted to the continent for the benefit of cheap living, and for other causes. Seeing so many of our countrymen wandering about the continent like sheep without a shepherd, the late bishop Walker, as already related, was induced to open a chapel for divine worship in the city of Rome itself. He says, he "lamented the residence of such crowds of our countrymen, whole families and children, in foreign countries. The evils are great in a political, moral, and fiscal point of view. Foreign travel has its advantages certainly, were it limited in numbers and duration, and to the proper age and station, as in time past; but when whole families emigrate and reside abroad for years, the evil predominates beyond all comparison; our patriotism, and our morals, and our religion, must inevitably suffer in consequence. . . . With all that the utmost candour will suggest or can allow, I shudder when I think of the consequences which may (which perhaps must) result from the long and familiar intercourse of our people of condition, and in easy circumstances, of our young men, young women, and children, with Italian society, of which the notions, the habits, and the conversation, are little suited to the genius, the decorum, and the principles of our happier country. There is one obvious and essential evil in such foreign residence to all classes, particularly to the young. They leave their religion, all the instituted means of grace, and opportunities of public worship, behind them; or, if they find them in this place or in that, it is by mere accident, often irregularly, and always for short intervals. It has often appeared to me astonishing that, apparently well-meaning people, for no conceivable

¹ Acts of Assembly, 998, Note.

purpose of real utility, should banish themselves for months and years, from all the nameless and interesting advantages of social religion, public worship, and divine ordinances, and go gazing from Sunday to Sunday, with idle and ignorant curiosity, at the pomps and shows of a church in the worship of which they can take no part¹."

SENTIMENTS VERY similar to those expressed by bishop Walker were felt by Dr. Luscombe, chaplain to the British embassy at Paris; and he conceived the idea of a missionary bishop being sent to the continent, as the appointed shepherd of all these wanderers, and to have temporary jurisdiction of such English clergymen as should settle in France, and officiate to English or American residents. The advertisement to Dr. Hook's sermon, who preached on the occasion, gives the reasons for this consecration.

"DURING A RESIDENCE of five years in France, the attention of Dr. Luscombe was naturally directed to the state of religion among his countrymen settled in that country, the number of whom actually resident is calculated at not less than 50,000; and he could not but observe with regret the great inconvenience and danger to which this large body of British subjects were exposed from the absence both of proper teachers, episcopally licensed and visited, and of the regular administration of the holy sacraments. He was more particularly awakened to the evils thus incurred by so large a portion of persons educated in the principles of the Church of England, by the representations of the most respectable amongst them, touching the rite of confirmation, from which their children were altogether excluded. This important want, coupled with the evident difficulty of holding a religious community together without some acknowledged tie or authorised bond of union, induced him to apply for advice and assistance to such of his friends in the church at home as by their station and talents might have sufficient influence to carry into effect his design for the prevention or remedy of an evil so obvious and injurious to the best interests of religion."

IT WAS AT FIRST thought that by the appointment of a suffragan to the bishop of London, this object might be attained; but the revival of an office so long disused was deemed objectionable. Numerous other difficulties also presented themselves, arising from the connection in this country between the church and state. Besides, before the English bishops could have consecrated Dr. Luscombe, they must have applied for

¹ Letters from Rome; Scottish Episcopal Magazine, i. 29, 30.

f parliament; which would have provoked a discussion was deemed prudent to avoid. Dr. Luscombe was addressed, therefore, by Dr. Hook, the father of the vicar of Leeds, archdeacon of Huntingdon, afterwards dean of Worcester, to lay his case before the bishops of Scotland, and to seek assistance from them which circumstances rendered it probable he would obtain in England. After a long conference, in which zeal and prudence equally marked the conduct of the Scotch prelates, they determined not only to adopt what was suggested by Dr. Luscombe, but, if he were willing to forego his prospects at home, to consecrate him as their ordinary bishop to his British fellow-subjects abroad. They had no objection to offer to his consecration; but at first they refused to act without the consent of government. On Dr. Luscombe's application, Mr. Canning was extremely kind; but declined to give any *direct* sanction on the part of his majesty's government, as it might involve them in difficulties with the government. He intimated, however, that if the Scottish prelates chose to act according to their own view of the expediency of the case, no opposition would be offered. Upon this arrangement, and the decision of the Scottish prelates, Dr. Luscombe did not for a moment hesitate to make the sacrifice of himself; and proceeding to the north, with Dr. Hook, father of Leeds, as his chaplain, he was canonically consecrated bishop of the church of Christ, at Stirling, on Sunday, the 1st day of March, 1825, by bishop Gleig, primus, assisted by Dr. Sandford, bishop of Edinburgh, and Dr. Low, bishop of Ross and Argyle¹.

THE OBJECT OF bishop Luscombe's mission will be best understood by the concluding words of the Letters of Collation delivered to him by the consecrators—"He is sent by us to bring the Scottish episcopal church to the continent of Europe, not as a diocesan bishop in the modern or limited sense of the word, but for a purpose similar to that for which Titus was sent by St. Paul in Crete—that he may set in order the things that are wanting among such of the natives of Great Britain and Ireland as he shall find there professing to be members of the united church of England and Ireland and the national church in Scotland. But as our blessed Lord, when he sent out his apostles, commanded them, saying, 'Go ye into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Gentiles enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel,'"

¹ The title prefixed to Dr. Hook's Consecration Sermon.—Perceval's Sermons, vol. 2, p. 256.—Private Information.

house of Israel ;' so we, following so divine an example, which was certainly left on record to the church to guide her conduct in making future converts to her faith, do solemnly enjoin our right rev. brother, bishop Luscombe, not to disturb the peace of any christian society established as the national church, in whatever nation he may chance to sojourn, but to confine his ministrations to British subjects, and to such other christians as may profess to be of a protestant episcopal church¹."

BISHOP LUSCOMBE'S mission afterwards received the countenance of government, and he was appointed permanent chaplain to the British embassy at Paris ; and on his arrival there the ambassador received him with every mark of respect. Bishop Luscombe also met with the hearty and cordial co-operation of all ranks and orders of British residents in Paris ; in which city he confirmed 120 young persons, and was assisted on this solemn occasion by eight clergymen. He also confirmed at St. Servan, when the Rev. S. Brereton, the minister, with captains Grant and Dent, lieutenant Chapman, and Dr. Newton, the wardens, drew up a respectful minute of the circumstance, expressive of their thankfulness for the blessing of a resident bishop²."

DR. LUSCOMBE is not recognised as a suffragan of Canterbury, and has nothing to do with the church of England ; but he represents the Scottish episcopal church in Paris. He has no jurisdiction in France, but merely acts as a clergyman in episcopal orders for the spiritual benefit of those congregations which place themselves under his control. The bishop of London has always been opposed to any assumption of jurisdiction on the part of bishop Luscombe ; and the English bishops do not require his official signature to the testimonials of clergymen living in France. The appointment of bishop Luscombe gave offence to Mr. Norris, of Hackney, and to some other sound churchmen, on the score of irregularity³. But the church of England has since followed the example of the church in Scotland, by the appointment of the bishops of Gibraltar and Jerusalem, whose position is fully as anomalous as bishop Luscombe's.

1826-27.—THE LORD FORBES was again sent down as commissioner in both these years to the Assembly. In their address to the king the Assembly paid a just tribute of respect to the memory of the late duke of York,—“To affections and manner, they say, which gave a charm to the intercourse of social life, there was added in the duke of York the nobler adorn-

¹ Advertisement, p. 1.

² Christian Remembrancer, vols. vii. viii.

³ Private Information.

ing of the most eminent official merit, the merit of an enlightened and benevolent and indefatigable zeal, in the discharge of the duties of his high appointment—the merit of having improved the condition and exalted the character of the British army to a degree of excellence which had never before been realized. If, in the late eventful contest, our countrymen achieved the most splendid victories which our history records—if, when the mighty strife was over, the men who had been accustomed to scenes of devastation and blood returned readily and at once to all the quiet and orderly habits of civil life,—if, while thus triumphant in war, they have also shewn themselves exemplary in peace,—to the duke of York's military administration, and to his solicitude for their religious instruction, it is owing, under Providence, that Britain has to boast of an army serving such a praise¹."

OVERTURES respecting the union of offices were again laid on the table of the house, and, after a long debate, it was moved and carried, "That the General Assembly, considering that there is at the present time, a royal commission holding sittings in this country for the remedy of all evils and inconveniences alleged to exist in the universities of Scotland, deem inexpedient to enter upon the consideration of the subject of the overtures on the table of this Assembly²."

1828.—AT THE MEETING of the Assembly this year, a complaint was preferred by the presbytery of Montrose that the episcopal teachers of that town had refused to admit the committee of the presbytery to visit their schools. This turned out to be a mistake, as it was not the teachers, but the magistrates of the borough, that endeavoured to prevent the presbytery from visiting and examining the episcopal schools³.

IT HAVING been considered necessary to revise the canons of 11, the primus summoned a synod to meet at Laurencekirk in June for that purpose, to be attended by all the bishops and the deans of dioceses, with one representative of the clergy in each diocese. The primus, with bishops Torry, Sandford, and Skinner, were present on the 18th of June; but bishops Haly and Low declined to attend, because they both "decidedly disapproved the holding of any synod at that time⁴." To the original preamble of 1811, the following clause was added—
"As, however, it is declared in the foregoing preamble to that effect, that the doctrine of the church and her government are fixed and unchangeable in those essential parts only of her constitution which were prescribed by her adorable Head; and

¹ Acts of Assembly, 999.

² Ibid. 1002.

³ Ibid. 1004.

⁴ Private Information.

that the character of immutability doth not attach to her discipline : and as the lapse of seventeen years had placed the Scottish episcopal church in circumstances which required a revisal and amendment of her canonical code, her bishops determined to hold a general synod for that purpose at Laurencekirk, in the county of Kincardine, on the 18th day of June, 1828 ; and did then, with the deans of their several districts, and another representative of the clergy of each district, form themselves into a synod of the whole church, thus constitutionally represented : and, after full deliberation and discussion, did ADOPT and SANCTION the following amended Code of Canons to be in future the stated regulations for preserving order and discipline in the said protestant episcopal church in Scotland¹." The following note is added to the end of the code of canons :—"The general synod of the protestant episcopal church in Scotland, holden at the town of Laurencekirk in the county of Kincardine, on the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth days of June, in the year of our Lord 1828, for the purpose of revising and improving the code of canons of the said episcopal church, which were enacted in a synod holden in the year of our Lord 1811, in the city of Aberdeen, having laboriously and attentively performed their task, DO most cordially and unanimously approve of the Canons, now amounting in number to THIRTY, and ENACT the same as the future canons and code of discipline of the said Protestant Episcopal Church, and DO SUBSCRIBE the same on this twentieth day of June aforesaid²." This code was signed by the primus and all the bishops who were present, with the deans and representatives of the clergy.

1829.—THE LORD FORBES again presided in the General Assembly, and its principal transaction was, to sanction a presbyterian mission to India, to propagate heresy and schism in that quarter. A Mr. Duff was admitted to their ministry, and sent out as the representative of the Scottish establishment, and, as Mr. Hetherington rather rashly says, "the first missionary ever sent forth by any protestant national church in its corporate character, left his native land, commissioned by the presbyterian church of Scotland to carry to India the light of gospel truth, and to offer for her acceptance the simple, pure, efficient, and most truly apostolic form of christianity, which is the glory and the strength of the presbyterian church!"³ It appears from the same authority that this so-called "apos-

¹ Preamble to the Code of Canons, 1828, pp. 18, 19.

² Ibid. 69, 70.

³ History, p. 234.

lic" mission for the propagation of heresy and schism has been so far countenanced by government as to have received legal countenance and support."

THE BUSINESS of the synod of last year had not been so well managed under the presidency of bishop Gleig as under that of the preceding Primus; and when the canons were printed and circulated, it was found that several things of importance had been omitted. The objections which had been stated by the bishops of Ross and Argyle and Moray, at the synod of last year, now received additional strength, and the Primus was induced to summon another synod, to meet at Edinburgh in July, which was fully attended; and the code that had been agreed on at Laurencekirk was revised, and some verbal alterations made in some of the canons. They were not, however, published at that time, but remained in manuscript for a new and more complete revision, with additions, in the year 1838.

IN THE YEAR 1828 the Popish agitators had a majority of 125 in the Commons, but the nation was under no great alarm, and a firm reliance was placed on the House of Peers, and on this occasion that House threw out the bill for their admission to power, that the Commons had sent up, by a majority of forty-six. Before the next session of parliament the ministers of the crown had determined to go over to the papists, at the very time that the nation was confidently reposing in their faithfulness and firmness. Their principal difficulty was with the king, whose opinions against the expediency of concession were deeply rooted. In a letter to the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, the duke of Wellington told his Excellency that "the Catholic question was a subject of which the king never hears without being disturbed." It may be supposed that ministers had used the same arguments to overcome his majesty's just objections as they afterwards employed to justify their own treachery to the nation. The duke of Wellington admitted in parliament that his efforts to obtain the king's consent had been incessant during the summer and autumn of 1828; and it was pleaded as the excuse for the short notice on which the measure was proposed, that the king's consent had only been wrung from him a few days before parliament met in February. His majesty had long resisted the insidious advice of his ministers; but in his infirm health and solitary position, he was unable to stand out against their concussion. They carefully concealed their intentions from all those councillors who were likely to come to his majesty's assistance; and, in short, the duke and others bullied him into that fatal and disastrous

measure, with the terror of the rebellion of the whole popish sect, and the dismemberment of his empire.

ABOUT THE END of January it began to be whispered that ministers intended to recommend extensive concessions to the Irish papists. The surprise which the announcement excited was only equalled by the indignation and contempt which so sudden and so total an abandonment of principle had aroused in the public mind. Those whom the protestant or reformed catholic party had trusted would have stood in the gap betwixt religion and idolatry, had been secretly plotting to give the enemy of civil and religious freedom a triumph. When the parliament met, the following clause in the royal speech shewed that the rumours were but too well-founded:—“His majesty recommends that . . you should take into your deliberate consideration the whole condition of Ireland, and that you should review the laws which impose civil disabilities on his majesty’s Roman Catholic subjects. You will consider whether the removal of those disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and permanent security of our establishments in church and state, with the maintenance of the reformed religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the bishops and of the clergy of this realm, and of the churches committed to their charge.”

A BILL PASSED both houses for the suppression of the treasonable association which had been so long permitted to insult and bully the government and the laws of the kingdom. Mr. Peel had the distinguished honour of sitting for the University of Oxford, on account of his hitherto firm opposition to popery. Conscious of his apostacy, he resigned his seat, and stood a contest with that noble and consistent champion of the church, sir Robert Harry Inglis; and to show their disgust at his dereliction of principle, he was defeated by a large majority. Mr. Peel was immediately returned by the burgh of Westbury; and, as its representative, he introduced that fatal measure, which, for the previous twenty years, he had solemnly protested was ruinous to our civil and religious freedom. On taking his seat, even so lately as for Westbury, he solemnly, as indeed every member of both houses of parliament did, took his oath, in the presence of God, of his firm belief that *popery is idolatry*; and then he deliberately proceeded to vote for a national union with that same idolatrous system! Every member had solemnly and deliberately sworn their full belief and persuasion, that the worship of the Host, and the adoration of the saints, are superstitious and idolatrous. It was asserted, that religion had nothing to do with the question of

granting *political* power to the subjects of the Pope in this country; but, on the contrary, it is evident that religion embraced the whole of it. "The admission of papists into parliament," says the bishop of Salisbury, "is contrary to our religion. The Articles of the Church of England are as much a part of our religion as the Articles of Pope Pius's Creed are of the religion of popery. By the 37th of our Articles we ascribe to the king the entire government of England, ecclesiastical as well as civil, and deny that the Pope has any jurisdiction in these realms. The admission of persons into parliament who are subjects of the Pope, and refuse to acknowledge the king's ecclesiastical supremacy, is to recognise in these realms that *foreign jurisdiction* which, by the law of church and state, we deny to exist¹." Mr. Faber goes farther, and says—"The admission of the Romanists to political power is a virtual declaration that his majesty is an usurper; and should his majesty be persuaded fatally to give his royal assent to this destructive suicidal measure, he would virtually confess the four reigns of the House of Brunswick to be one continued act of unjustifiable usurpation²."

THE COUNTRY had covered the tables of both houses of parliament with petitions against the proposed engrafting of idolatry on the constitution; but so sudden and so extraordinary was the change in the opinions of the majority of both houses, that the people were left without leaders. All the talkers of the ministry were joined to all the talkers of the opposition; the whole mass of ministerial influence was brought into play to gain votes, under threats of dismissal from office or of ministerial displeasure. Both ministers and their former adversaries united in a fixed determination, at whatever cost, to carry this suicidal measure, and to disregard the most united and universal popular opposition legitimately and temperately exhibited in their petitions. If a judgment may be formed from the number of petitions with which the tables of both houses were loaded, the proposed measure was one to which the public mind of Britain was utterly averse. On the 30th March the third reading of the Emancipation bill was moved by Mr. Peel, and carried by a majority of 178, there being in its favour 320, and against it 142. Thus, in only three weeks from the time at which it had been introduced, was passed an iniquitous bill, of a more dangerous nature than any of the

¹ Letter to the Duke of Wellington, p. 2.

² Letter to the "Record," in reply to Dr. Chalmers' Speech; Tract, pp. 10, 11.

popish plots, which, by the goodness of God, had been hitherto defeated, and the consequences of which have been even more disastrous than its opponents had prognosticated. On the 31st of March the bill was carried to the Lords, and read a first time, to the dismay of the people, who had placed their last hope on the firmness of that house which had thrown out the bill of the former year by a majority of forty-six. The archbishop of Canterbury moved that the bill be read that day six months. The archbishop of Armagh contended that the bill before the house would increase the power of the papists, without lessening their wish to do mischief. "If, he said, the house could subdue the intolerant spirit of the church of Rome, disarm the priests of their influence over the people, and withdraw the people from their allegiance to the see of Rome, making them citizens of their own country, and letting them take their stand among other dissenters, in such a position as the wisdom of parliament might think proper to place them, it would be well. But would any man say that they could make the church of Rome tolerant, or persuade the priesthood of that church to hold an inferior rank to a clergy the validity of whose orders they denied, and whose church they reviled as adulterous? Could any one suppose that the Roman Catholic priests would quit their hold upon the consciences, the wills, and the passions of men, when their spiritual despotism was the most powerful engine for their own aggrandisement? The Roman Catholic priesthood must ever stand alone. It had set the *indelible mark of separation* on its own forehead by its unnatural though politic restrictions—by its claim to exclusive pre-eminence—and by its dangerous and unconstitutional connection with a foreign state. . . . The confederacy of the priesthood, actuated by a hatred of whatever was protestant, would leave no means untried to exalt their church at the expense of the protestant establishment, especially when they found that those who ought to support that establishment were divided into parties. Such must be their object and their wishes, and this bill furnished them with the means of compassing both." On the division, the same House of Peers which last year had declared, by a majority of 46, that emancipation was manifestly a breach of the constitution, and too dangerous to the reformed Catholic church to be even discussed, now, in the course of one short year, declared that it was altogether consistent with the constitution, and not dangerous to the church! The bill was carried on the 10th of April, by a majority of 104; 213 peers having voted

or it, and 109 against it. On the 13th of April it received the royal assent by commission¹.

PERHAPS SINCE the Revolution there has not been a more important recommendation from the throne than that which proposed a revision of those statutes that excluded the papists from political power, as it overthrew the very principles upon which the present dynasty acquired the sceptre. All our national institutions are founded upon the principle that every constituted authority shall be exclusively protestant; and upon this principle alone rests the rights of the House of Brunswick to the throne. By the passing of the popish "Emancipation" Act, this fundamental principle was relinquished, and with that the principle on which the House of Stuart was excluded from the throne of their illustrious ancestors. At the same time parliament most sinfully ingrafted the grossest and most senseless *idolatry* upon the heretofore purely christian constitution of England; and the parliament that did so, clearly *perjured* themselves, inasmuch as every one of the members of both houses had taken a solemn oath, in the presence of Almighty God, that they knew and believed popery to be idolatry. "It was once our boast," says bishop Douglass, of Salisbury, "and our happiness, and, as we believed, the ground of our prosperity, that the law of England was, in its foundation and its practices, eminently in accordance with the law of God. We have been accustomed to say—'What nation is there so great, that hath God so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is, in all things that we pray unto him for?' But if popery be admitted into the constitution of England, and papists into her highest councils, by such advancement of popery, and union with her idolatry, we recognise the worship not of one God, but of many—not one Saviour, but of many; we are directly opposed to that spirit of all sanctions, the law of God; and incur the risk of those calamities which are threatened 'to the third and fourth generations of them that hate God.' This denunciation, your grace is well aware, respects that highest offence against the majesty of God, which is condemned by the second commandment, and of which the church of Rome is guilty, by worshipping the bread which they make with their own hands; and to which idolatry parliament will become *parties and accessories*, if the bill for admitting papists into parliament should pass into a law. Of the consequences to be expected from such recognition and legal encouragement of

¹ Annual Register for the Year 1829, p. 1-97.

idolatry, by a nation which Providence has so long blessed with a purer religion, and which has so long protested against the idolatry of the church of Rome, collectively by her laws and religion, and individually by her public functionaries in parliament and out of it, I need not remind your grace, because the Bible is full of God's severest judgments and heaviest curses, inflicted on the Jewish people from time to time, for their idolatry, through many centuries before they ceased to be a nation¹."

THE KING'S VISIT to his ancient kingdom was a source of unmingled satisfaction to his northern subjects; but especially to such aged men as had been sufferers for their attachment to the family of the Stuarts. These men came up to welcome their sovereign, and to salute him as the rightful occupant of the throne, and to yield to him an homage which, forty years before that, they would not have bestowed upon him for all that he could have bestowed on them in return, although he was then confessedly the greatest monarch on earth. "To welcome a king in days of peace and unanimity, and to hail with gladness the descendant of a royal house, whom all voices own, and whom all hearts acknowledge, is at once a delight and a duty; but it was a far different service to do homage to a sovereign when forsaken and cast down—a fugitive in the land of his fathers—poor and houseless—fleeing from death himself, and carrying the terror of death into every dwelling where he took refuge. It is a simple thing to join in the shout of thousands, and to contribute to the demonstrations of happiness in the presence of a powerful monarch, when he sets his foot on our shores; but it required a stronger attachment and a deeper *principle* to welcome a prince whose only power consisted in what was deemed his *right*, and whose failure was sure to involve thousands in misery and exile, or expose them to the more appalling horrors of the dungeon, and even of a violent death. The principle may have been a mistaken one, but there can be no doubt of its sincerity, nor of its powerful influence on the minds of those who held it. In a track of country so wild and so barren as not to find shelter to the eagle nor food for the conies of the rock, there was still found a ready and secure refuge for an unfortunate prince, when pursued by his enemies; and hundreds there were who were still prepared to give their life for his, in the hour of his greatest peril. Nor was the romantic and chivalrous attachment to which we now allude less strik-

¹ Letter to the Duke of Wellington.

ing than *the principle* which gave it birth ; for the ill-fated Charles Edward was to the last followed and guarded by men whose faithfulness to him, as it was *founded on principle*, no earthly motive could shake, and no worldly bribe could violate. . . . These facts, then, comparatively so recent, gave value to the expressions of loyalty when uttered by those who inherited the names and the principles of those faithful and devoted characters who stood by their king when fortune and life were at stake, and who forsook him not when hope was gone, and when life, fortune, and title, were either forfeited or actually lost. The facts above mentioned are brought forward solely to point out the *value of principle*, and its powerful operation even on the least cultivated minds, and, above all, to give a practical illustration of that steady, ardent, and invincible loyalty, which is founded on the basis of religious belief¹."

THE ESTABLISHMENT of a reformed catholic chapel in the city of Rome, and of a catholic bishop in the city of Paris, are two events that may be productive of the greatest and most beneficial effects to the christian world. Both these missions, if we may so speak, have originated with the catholic church of Scotland ; and in both cases alike she disclaims all intention of schism, or of interference with the national catholic churches of these places. The bishop in the one city, and the priest in the other, were not established for the purpose of making converts, or of ministering to the native population, but simply as overseers of the British residents in those cities, and of watching over their spiritual interests. I have heard the late bishop Walker say, that the pope privately assured him, that, although he could not give him ostensibly permission, yet he said he might *take* leave, and his holiness would take care that neither he nor his congregation should be disturbed in the exercise of their religious rites, so long as they did not offend the religious prejudices of the people. Bishop Luscombe pretends to no jurisdiction in France, beyond the English or American congregations that voluntarily place themselves under his episcopal authority ; and the English priest in Rome confines his ministration to the Anglo-catholics who happen to reside there for the time being. There is no infringement of the just rights of either the archbishop of Paris or the patriarch of Rome, and therefore no schism ; but each may with justice say, with the ancient and purer Roman church, " One God, one Christ, one Bishop."

¹ Scottish Epis. Mag. ii. 474.

CHAPTER LXXX.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. GEORGE GLEIG, LL. D.
BISHOP OF BRECHIN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1830.—Death of bishop Sandford.—Rev. Dr. Walker elected to the see of Edinburgh—consecrated—extract from the consecration sermon.—Bishop Walker visits his diocese.—General Assembly.—The Apocrypha controversy.—Apocrypha not inspired scripture.—1831.—St. Paul's chapel, Aberdeen.—A pamphlet controversy.—Bishop Skinner's letter.—Assembly—universal redemption.—Bishop Low.—The Gaelic episcopal society—its object.—1832.—Voluntary associations.—United secession.—Basis of union among the voluntaries.—Confirmations, ordinations, and appointments.—1833.—Porto Bello.—Action at law.—Church of Ireland.—Church in Paisley—in Ayr.—Resistance to payment of tithes in Edinburgh.—Inductions, ordinations, confirmations.—1834.—Town-council of Paisley.—Chapels of ease.—Lord Moncrief's act.—Veto act.—1835.—Ten Irish bishopricks suppressed.—Addresses to the archbishop of Canterbury—and to the king.—Church of Ireland.—Gaelic society—remarks on it.—Number of episcopalians in Glasgow—in Ross and Argyle.—Incomes of the clergy—measures for their relief.—Confirmations.—A new congregation in Glasgow.—Dr. Bell's school.—Bishops Maltby and Ives preach in Edinburgh.—Auchterarder.—A fast.—1836.—Sympathy for the Irish church.—An address to the Irish primate—his grace's answer.—Bishop Walker's letter.—Confirmation, and other transactions.—Diocese of Glasgow.—Sheriff Alison.—Friendly society.—1837.—Church in the Isle of Skye—in Inverness.—Confirmations.—The Errol schools.—Church in Skye.—Resignation of the primus.—State of the church—and of the establishment.

1830.—AFTER A SHORT illness, the right rev. Dr. Sandford, bishop of Edinburgh, died in that city, in the sixty-fourth year of his age, having sat bishop of that see since the year 1806. He was interred in the cemetery at the east end of his own church of St. John the Evangelist; and the congregation have since erected a monument to his memory in that church, on the north side of the altar.

**TO NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY**

**ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS**



IN THE MONTH of February the primus sent a mandate to the dean of Edinburgh and the clergy of the united dioceses of Glasgow, Galloway, and Fife, to elect a bishop, when the James Walker, D.D. formerly minister of St. Peter's church and then professor of theology, was unanimously elected. The election was confirmed with equal unanimity by the other bishops, and he was consecrated at Stirling, on Sunday the 10th of March, by Dr. Gleig, bishop of Brechin and primus, assisted by Dr. Jolly, bishop of Moray, Dr. Skinner, bishop of Aberdeen, and Dr. Low, bishop of Ross and Argyle¹. The Rev. DR. MICHAEL RUSSELL, minister of St. James' church, Edinburgh, preached the consecration sermon, in the conclusion of which he says,—“As a member of the diocese over which the new bishop is to preside, I may perhaps be permitted to express, in the name of my clerical brethren, the satisfaction with which this event is contemplated, and the unbounded confidence which they repose in his wisdom, his principles, his impartiality, and, above all, in the knowledge which he possesses of his own duty and of theirs, and in his ardent devotedness to that cause which they also are equally disposed to be equally bound to maintain. In the step which it was their duty and their privilege to take, in electing their diocesan, there was not only unanimity, there was also affection, combined with an earnest desire to mix their individual regard for his person with their professional respect for his office. In this case, too, the choice of the clergy has been amply and universally approved by the suffrages of the laity; by those whose spiritual welfare depends upon the due and rightful ministry of an apostolic church².” Bishop Walker had resigned the charge of St. Peter's the previous year, and his colleague, REV. CHARLES HUGHES TERROTT, succeeded him in the charge of that chapel. The bishop, however, retained his appointment as Pantonian professor of divinity till his death. This professorship was founded and endowed by Dr. Pantoun; and Dr. Walker was appointed the first professor. In the summer of this year, bishop Walker held a private visitation of all the congregations of his united dioceses, Pittenweem excepted, which was a peculiar of the bishop of Ross and Argyle for the time being. The prelate resided there, and officiated in that small congregation; and consequently, during his incumbency, it is

¹ Perceval's Apology, 256.

² The Historical Evidence for the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, vol. 7, 58.

attached to his diocese of Ross and Argyle¹. During his visitation, he confirmed the young people in all the congregations.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY met on the 20th of May, and lord Forbes represented the sovereign. The report of a committee that had been appointed to inquire into the state of the parochial schools was read and approved. The committee stated, that they “had great satisfaction in perceiving, that where the duty of presbyterial examination of schools has regularly taken place, the very best effects have resulted from it; that the methods of teaching have been improved—that the zeal and diligence both of the teachers and the taught have been powerfully excited. And the committee cannot conclude this report without expressing their earnest desire that the venerable Assembly would continue to enforce upon all the presbyteries of this church, and especially upon those from whom no returns have come, the faithful performance of a duty so eminently calculated to produce the best interests of the rising generation².”

FOR A FEW YEARS previous to this Assembly, the kirk had been agitated in a most extraordinary degree by a controversy that arose respecting the propriety of printing the Apocrypha along with the small Bibles circulated by the Bible Society; one party vainly imagining that the papists would be cajoled into reading the Scriptures by having the Apocrypha, which they consider inspired scripture, printed with it. This met with strong opposition from another party. But Christ himself has set His mark to that which is to be considered the Holy Scripture; namely, the law of Moses—the Prophets—and the Psalms, which contain all things that were written concerning Him, and that either have or will be fulfilled³. The author himself, of one of the Apocryphal books, makes an apology for his work, saying, “If I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if *slenderly* and *meanly*, it is that which *I could attain unto*⁴.” No holy man of God, speaking as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, would ever have said his performance was slender and mean; it would be blasphemy to ascribe such an excuse to Him; therefore the Apocrypha is not inspired canonical scripture. The Jewish church never received it as canonical, neither do the poor wandering outcast descendants of that church receive it as inspired scripture to this day. But the

¹ Vide *ante*, cap. lxix. p. 297.

² Acts of Assembly, 1011.

³ ST LUKE, xxiv. 44.

⁴ MACABEES, xv. 38.—2 ST. PETER, i. 20, 21.

church of Rome, by her own usurped authority, has declared it to be part of the canon of scripture, and thereby has incurred the awful denunciation of the Holy Spirit¹. It is, however, but fair to the kirk, to say that she does not admit of the inspiration of the Apocryphal books—"the books commonly called Apocrypha, *not being of divine inspiration*, are no part of the canon of Scripture, and therefore are of no authority in the church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of than other human writings²."

1831.—THERE WERE STILL THREE Independent congregations who called themselves "English episcopalians;" but that one which has always been the most unreasonable and troublesome has been St. Paul's meeting-house, at Aberdeen. Many attempts have been made to reconcile the vestrymen, and to draw their ministers and people into the apostolic fellowship. For this purpose, early in January this year, a clergyman of the church of England published a small tract, setting forth the anomalous position of the congregation of St. Paul's, shewing the advantages they would derive from an union, and earnestly entreating them to allow themselves to be added to the church³. This tract was immediately answered by one of the managers of the meeting-house, a Dr. Henderson, who endeavoured, by unfair quotations and inferences, to fasten sinful terms of communion on the church; and therefore he tries to shew that it "is the bounden duty of every man who holds to the doctrines of the church of England" to separate from the Catholic church of Scotland⁴. The war of words was now fairly commenced, and Henderson was attacked in a clever pamphlet, by Mr. John Smith, "a Scotch episcopalian," who, says Henderson's pamphlet, with certain verbal alterations, would have suited the meridian of the Bible Society, of which it seems Henderson was a leading man. The pen of a distinguished clergyman was also called into the field, who examined Dr. Henderson's Examination, shewed the fallacy of his arguments, and the ignorance which he displayed in his strictures on the doctrines of the church. The learned author then entered into a general defence of the canons and the communion-office of the Scottish church, and shewed that the clergy of that church "willingly and *ex animo* subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledge all and every of them to be agree

¹ REVEL. xli. 18, 19.

² Conf. of Faith, ch. i. sect. 3.

³ Considerations on the Expediency of the Congregation of St. Paul's Chapel, in Aberdeen, uniting themselves to the Episcopal Church in Scotland. 1831.

⁴ An Examination of a Pamphlet, &c. by one of the managers of St. Paul's. 19th January, 1831.

able to the Word of God. Affixed to this pamphlet was a copy of a brief but very excellent letter, written by Dr. Skinner, the bishop of the diocese, addressed to the "Managers of St. Paul's chapel;" in a sort of preface to which the bishop says,—“Through the indulgence of the publishers of this little work—put forth, as he understands, in defence of the cause which he himself advocates—the writer of the following letter, addressed to the managers of St. Paul's chapel, Aberdeen, so far back as the 22d of January, is enabled, in compliance with a recommendation to that effect from these gentlemen, to submit the same to the attentive consideration both of the public and of those for whose information it was originally intended. It has ever been far from his inclination to court publicity in such matters, but being thus unceremoniously attacked, if not personally, yet in connection with a church in which he has for years held a conspicuous station, and of which the soundness and sincerity as to her religious principles have been called in question—upon what grounds he readily leaves a discerning public to decide,—the writer certainly had no alternative left. He trusts, however, that as it is the first, it shall also be the last occasion upon which he shall be compelled to make such an appearance¹.” Dr. Henderson again replied, and the whole was wound up by a letter from the Rev. John Skinner, of Forfar, addressed to the constituent members of St. Paul's meeting-house, earnestly entreating them to disregard the fallacious arguments produced by their champion, and to join themselves to the only church that “was authorised to receive them into communion.”

THE ASSEMBLY met on the 19th of May, and lord Belhaven represented the sovereign. The Assembly deposed Mr. Campbell, minister of the parish of Row, in Dumbartonshire, “on account of his holding and teaching *the heretical doctrine of universal redemption*, together with several other erroneous tenets².” What those other erroneous tenets were we are not told; but their calling universal redemption *heretical doctrine*, shows how far the kirk has departed from the faith. But its confession is heretical, for it asserts, that *none are redeemed by Christ but the ELECT ONLY*, in their sense of election³. When St. Paul says, that “*all* have sinned,” they allow the word *all* to mean all that have ever proceeded from the loins of Adam; but when the same apostle says, “as by the

¹ Dr. Henderson's Examination examined: and his allegations respecting the episcopal church in Scotland proved to be unfounded, by an Episcopalian. 1831.

² Hetherington, 234.

³ Westminster Confession, ch. iii. sect. 6.

fence of one [Adam], judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation; *even so* by the righteousness of ONE [Christ], the free gift [of redemption] came unto *all men* unto justification of life¹," they understand the apostle's *all* to be restricted in the second clause, and to mean only *the elect*, in their sense. The doctrine of their confession, and the judgment of this assembly, are in direct opposition to the teaching of God through the apostle; therefore it is an heretical doctrine, and is to be repented of.

THE ACTIVE ZEAL of bishop Low induced him, soon after his consecration, to visit his extensive and distant diocese. The population knowing little else than the Gaelic language, was extremely difficult to instruct them. Bishop Low supported some teachers for some time from his own resources; but the demand for education becoming greater than the supply, he projected a society, through whose exertions the poor of his diocese might be benefitted. THE GAELIC EPISCOPAL SOCIETY was formed accordingly in Edinburgh, at the suggestion of the bishop of Ross and Argyle, under the superintendence of the bishops, and a committee was also established in London, to collect funds there in aid of its objects, which were four-fold: to provide means for the due education of Gaelic students for the ministry—to send catechists into the more scattered portions of the church, who may visit from house to house in those spots where the clergyman cannot frequently come—to aid the erection of school-houses, and the repair and improvement of places of worship—and more extensively to circulate the Gaelic Book of Common Prayer. The demand for Gaelic copies of the Prayer Book was in steady increase. A clergyman, and a sound Celtic scholar, writes,—“I conceive that a new and improved, and large edition of this work, in which the peculiar tenets of the gospel are so intimately interwoven, and throughout which the spirit of the gospel is so admirably diffused, is much called for at present. The people in the highlands are generally taught to read in their own language; they are daily acquiring a taste for reading, and now is the time to give that taste its proper direction. A hundred can now read for one that could read twelve years ago. It is folly, from the present state of the highlands, to cast off small editions of such a work. Either the Gaelic Episcopalians will forsake their church, which is not likely, or a very great demand will arise for the Prayer Book, in consequence of the advanced state of education among them.” The

¹ Romans, iii. 23; v. 18, 19.

objects which the Gaelic Episcopal Society “ have in view are legitimate and important. They cannot be accomplished without benevolent assistance; and the demand for that assistance is most urgent. They venture to trust that many will take a lively interest in the spiritual welfare of a church which, through all its vicissitudes, has patiently and steadfastly adhered to its principles. In a period when christian liberality is fertilizing and gladdening the most desolate plains of the heathen wilderness, they hope that the necessities of the church at home will be supplied; and that, under the superintendence of this society, such assistance may be furnished as shall ensure to the Gaelic districts of the episcopal church the means of decent worship, and of adequate pastoral instruction¹.”

1832.—A NEW AND formidable enemy to the kirk started up about this time, in the shape of VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS, for the severance of the state from religion. This subject had been silently working in the minds of the presbyterians of all sorts, but especially among the seceders. That body had split into a number of adverse sects, yet all maintaining the original opposition to patronage, which had been the primary cause of their secession. In 1820 several of these disjointed parties, after having compromised their differences, and abandoned their original principles, coalesced on the basis of hostility to all national establishments, and formed themselves into one body, under the denomination of the “ UNITED SECESSION CHURCH.” The leaders of this body met at a public breakfast in the Royal Hotel, Edinburgh, and, after some foolish and some intemperate speeches, they moved resolutions indicating the most mortal war against all establishments but that of Scotland in particular. The Reform of Parliament gave a considerable impetus to the voluntary principle, and it even made converts among the established ministers themselves. Attempts were made in several of the presbyteries to procure the abolition of lay patronage, and eight of them, with their provincial synods, sent up overtures to the Assembly for that purpose; but the motion for a committee to deliberate on the subject was rejected by a majority of forty-two.

THE VOLUNTARIES thought proper to fraternise with all parties, however discordant in principles, and offered the following principle as the bond of union:—“ That a compulsory support of religious institutions is inconsistent with the

¹ Charity Sermon in behalf of the Gaelic Episcopal Society, with Rules prefixed; by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Walker, 9-12.

nature of religion, the spirit of the gospel, the express appointment of Jesus Christ, and the civil rights of men. That in every case where the *individual disapproves* of the system supported, or of the principle of its support, it is an unwarrantable attack on the right of property, and a direct invasion of the rights of conscience. That it keeps in a state of unnatural separation those who ought to be united, and in a state of unnatural union those who ought to be separated; that its tendency, as exhibited in its effects, is to secularise religion, promote hypocrisy, perpetuate error, produce infidelity, destroy the unity and the purity of the church, and disturb the peace and order of civil society. That by its direct and indirect influence it is among the principal causes of the low state of christianity in those countries where it is professed, and of the slowness of its progress throughout the world; and that while thus unreasonable, impolitic, unjust, and mischievous, it has not even the plea of necessity; christianity having within itself, in the native influence of its doctrines on the minds of those who believe them, every thing which is requisite for its efficient support and indefinite extension¹." It was expected that the episcopal church would have joined the Voluntaries, and an association in Fife sent a circular to the Rev. John Marshall, priest of Kirkaldy, in the diocese of St. Andrews, requesting him to attend their convention at a meeting house in Leslie, and to bring one or two active members of his congregation. This invitation Mr. Marshall rejected with indignation; and he may be said to have been the organ of the church in disclaiming all hostility to the establishment, and of returning their former evil with charitable sympathy and support.

AT THE VISITATION of his diocese this year, the bishop of Aberdeen confirmed four hundred and sixty-two young people. The Gaelic Episcopal Society's committee resolved to translate into Gaelic, and to circulate among the highlanders, Faber's Facts and Assertions respecting Popery, and some other works of a similar kind; also a selection from the Homilies. The committee obtained the promise of assistance, in their translations, from some of the most eminent Gaelic scholars connected with the establishment, as well as with our own church; and good hopes were entertained that these publications would be instrumental, under divine favour, in checking the increase of popery among the highlanders².

THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH appointed the Rev. Michael

¹ Episcopal Magazine, i. 16.

² Ibid. 22.

Russell, of St. James's church, Leith, dean of the united dioceses of Edinburgh, Fife, Glasgow, and Galloway. The bishop of Dunkeld and Dunblane held an ordination in Peterhead, when the reverends Alexander Cooper and Alexander Lendrum, deacons, were ordained priests. The Rev. C. H. Terrott resigned St. Peter's chapel, and was presented to St. Paul's church, in York Place; and the Rev. C. J. Lyon, author of the elaborate History of St. Andrews, was inducted into St. Andrews' episcopal church, in the city of St. Andrews¹.

IN JULY this year, bishop Low held a confirmation at Inverness, when forty persons received that rite; considerable interest was added to the solemnity by the confirmation of a party of young soldiers of the regiment of Royals, quartered at Fort George. The decorous and serious manner of the young soldiers was remarked by all present. The bishop went afterwards to Rosse Chapel, Fort William, and delivered an impressive charge to the clergy. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Duncan Mackenzie, and the service was, for the first time, accompanied by an organ, for the acquisition of which the congregation was chiefly indebted to the Rev. A. Maclellan. A large party of the highland gentlemen entertained the bishop and clergy at dinner; sir J. M. Riddell, of Ardnamurchan, in the chair. Bishop Low confirmed in the different congregations of Argyle and Lochaber, but the most interesting was that held at Kinlochline, in Morven, which he visited for the first time, and where, perhaps, no episcopal offices had been performed since the Reformation².

1833.—IN THE YEAR 1825, colonel Haliburton, Mr. Rutherford, and his wife, procured a piece of ground from the marquis of Abercorn, at Portobello, a bathing village in the immediate neighbourhood of Edinburgh, on which they erected St. Mark's Chapel, and enclosed the ground for a cemetery. Both the chapel and the burial-ground were consecrated in 1828 by bishop Sandford. A Mr. Swan, who had built a house in the vicinity, obtained an interdict from the sheriff, on the pretence of the cemetery being a nuisance; and, besides, he maintained that the privilege of burying-grounds was annexed exclusively to parish churchyards, and, in this case, to the parish of Duddingstone. It was answered, that that might be reserved from chapels of ease or dissenting meeting-houses; but it did not apply to members of the church, whose privileges were secured by acts of parliament, and who, besides, would not bury their dead in unconsecrated ground. After a full dis-

¹ Episcopal Magazine, i. 47, 48.

² British Magazine, ii. 110.

union on the merits of the case, the sheriff-depute, Mr. Duff, inspected the premises personally, and directed an engineer to make a regular report; after which he pronounced the following interlocutor:—The sheriff finds it not alleged by the pursuer [plaintiff] that the defendants' premises are subject to any servitude *altius non tollendi*: finds it does not appear from the report that the raising of the defenders' grounds can be objected to by the pursuer on any legal ground: finds that the pursuer is not entitled to have any interdict against the defendant on a legal ground as a nuisance: dismisses the petition, and finds neither party entitled to expenses. Mr. Swan appealed to the Court of Session, and, after a full hearing, the sheriff's decision was confirmed; and the court ordered the plaintiff to pay the whole expense incurred by the defenders in both courts¹.

AT THIS TIME the established catholic church of Ireland suffered a dreadful persecution from the papists, under the pretence of resistance to tithes. The "Cork Constitution" says "The clergymen are coming into town with their families to save themselves from *assassination*. The churches of all such places have been driven to this step for the preservation of their persons, are closed, and their congregations must want the word of God which they had heretofore enjoyed. This is a summary way of overthrowing religion—*murder* or put to flight the clergy—shut up the churches, and religion will no longer have teachers to instruct, nor congregations to learn, the ways of salvation²." As a corresponding sign of the times, Paine's *Age of Reason*, and his *Rights of Man*, were published in Scotland at a cheap rate, and men hawked these publications from door to door, and found a ready sale for them³.

IN THE MONTH of July a new episcopal church at Paisley was opened for public worship, dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Mr. Wade, the incumbent, stated in his sermon, when he commenced his labours fifteen years previously in a school-room, that it was the first time since the Revolution that an episcopal clergyman had officiated in that town. At his commencement more than fourteen episcopalians attended his ministry; but less than a year the congregation had increased to about a hundred. More accommodation was required, but it was too hazardous a step to erect a church, and therefore a public hall was hired on a lease of fourteen years. Towards the end of that period a subscription was commenced for the erection of

¹ Episcopal Magazine, i. 102, 103.

² Ibid. 104.

³ British Magazine, ii. 626.

Trinity Church, a neat gothic structure, capable, with galleries, of containing a congregation of six hundred. The church was beginning to expand after a century of oppression and persecution. The episcopalians in the town and of Ayr had now become so numerous as to require a regular clergyman, and, in June, the bishop of Ross and Argyle, by the authority of the bishop of Edinburgh, instituted the Rev. W. S. Walker to the pastoral charge of that congregation, and afterwards confirmed several young persons. At this time the episcopal ministers of Edinburgh experienced a very severe and increasing persecution from their own flocks, and from the sect who refused to pay the only relic of direct tithing left in the kingdom. They pursued a species of passive resistance, and suffered their effects to be distrained; but no one could be found to purchase them¹. Owing to the ill health of Walker, the bishop of Ross and Argyle inducted the Rev. C. J. Lyon into St. Andrew's Church, in St. Andrew, and ordained Mr. Goalen, his own curate, a priest, on St. Andrew's day, after which he confirmed the young members of the congregation, and administered the communion to a respectable congregation². The bishop of Aberdeen held an ordination in his own church in that city, and admitted two gentlemen into the order of deacons. Bishop Walker held a confirmation at Dumfries, when the two sons of sir James Allan Paterson attended the forenoon and afternoon services. Upwards of eighty persons were confirmed, and the church was crowded. Walker held his triennial visitation in St. Mary's Church, Glasgow, and also confirmed the youth of the two congregations in that city³.

1834.—AS A PREGNANT SIGN of the voluntary system, the town-council of Paisley refused to walk in procession to the kirk, agreeably to custom; and even went so far in the novelty as to propose to sell one of the kirks, which will accommodate about 800 persons, for the sum of £350, to redeem the corporation of the corporation! "They consider they have no call to provide churches *for the poor people!* and have nothing to do with supporting any one particular religion; and the country will never prosper till the established church is reduced to a level with the dissenters⁴!" The inherent weakness of presbyterianism was now conspicuously developed, and the strength of the movement party was annually increasing. It had been one of their chief objects for some years

¹ Episcopal Magazine, l. 231-264.

² British Magazine, iv. 478.

³ Ibid. 391.

⁴ Edinburgh Advertiser.

increase their strength by the admission of the ministers of chapels of ease to seats in the General Assembly, and to all the privileges of parochial ministers, to which they are not legally eligible. In the last Assembly a "declaratory enactment" authorised the erection of separate parishes for the parliamentary chapels, and admitted about forty of their ministers to the full position of the parochial ministers. Lord Belhaven was again sent down as commissioner; and Hetherington asserts that this Assembly "must ever be held as one of the most memorable whose proceedings have been recorded in the annals of the Church of Scotland." A motion was made by lord Moncrief, a judge, declaring that the disapproval of a majority of male heads of families, being communicants, should be deemed sufficient ground for the presbytery to reject the presentee of the patron. After a long and able debate this motion was carried by a majority of forty-six in a full house. The resolutions on lord Moncrief's motion were converted into overtures, and sent to the presbyteries; but in the meantime they were made an interim act, and carried into immediate effect, contrary to their own barrier law, and in defiance of the British parliament. This has been since known as the VERO ACT, the operations of which gave the ultra-Calvinistic or highflying party an immediate and disastrous ascendancy in the assemblies and inferior courts¹."

IN APRIL THIS YEAR a new episcopal church was opened in the Rue d'Aguesseau, in Paris, of gothic architecture, and capable of containing a congregation of 800 persons. This may be called the English cathedral in Paris, as it is in it that bishop Luscombe officiates. By a melancholy coincidence, the church was, in December of this year, deprived by death of three of her oldest clergymen, all of whom had felt the horrors of the last persecution, viz. the very reverend Alexander Shand, dean of Aberdeen, and minister for forty-five years at Arradoul in that diocese; rev. Alexander Cruickshanks, for many years minister of Muthill in Perthshire, and the rev. George Garden, minister of Stonehaven, in the diocese of Brechin².

1835.—THIS WAS A TIME of rebuke and blasphemy, when the church was threatened with destruction by profligate statesmen, one of whom, in the "spirit of the age," insolently recommended the bishops of England to "set their house in order;" and his administration passed a bill for the suppression of *ten* bishopricks in Ireland "at one fell swoop!" This

¹ Acts of Assembly, 1035.—Dublin Review, No. 37, p. 78.—Hetherington, p. 240.

² Aberdeen Journal.

sacrilegious act, together with sundry other indications of further assaults, under the direction of a Socinian influence, excited the zeal and energy of certain good men in the church of England to rouse her from her apathy, and to stimulate her to put forth her strength now in the hour of danger. An appeal was made extensively to the members of the church of England for their support in the firm and practical maintenance of the doctrine of the apostolical succession, and the preservation in its integrity of the christian doctrine in our Prayer-Book, with a view to avert the Socinian leaven in the threatened parliamentary alterations of it. The result of this appeal was a clerical address to the archbishop of Canterbury, which was signed by about 7000 of the clergy ; and another was the lay declaration of attachment to the church, signed by upwards of 230,000 heads of families¹. “ From which two events,” says Mr. Perceval, “ we may date the commencement of the turn of the tide which had threatened to overthrow our church and our religion.” The church in Scotland, partaking of the same alarm, sent the following address to king William, which was presented by the archbishop of Canterbury, and it was received in the most gracious manner by his majesty :—

“ WE, YOUR MAJESTY’S most dutiful and loyal subjects, the persons subscribing in our own names, and in the name of the *episcopal church in Scotland*, beg leave to approach your sacred person with sentiments of the most profound attachment and loyalty. Whilst we tender our most grateful thanks for the toleration we enjoy in common with all your majesty’s subjects, we beg leave, adopting as we do the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the united church of England and Ireland, humbly to offer our heartfelt sympathy for the present distressing state of that portion of the church which is established in Ireland, and to express our alarm and conviction that the threatened attack of the church, if extended to England, will be attended with all the calamitous consequences of the grand rebellion. Although we cannot conscientiously unite in communion with the ecclesiastical establishment in Scotland, yet we live in terms of perfect harmony with its ministers and members ; and we regard with sincere and friendly concern the machinations which have been formed against that establishment, as well by pretended friends as by

¹ A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833, by the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B.C.L. 2d edit. 1843, pp. 11, 12.

professed enemies ; the principles of that branch of the church of Christ to which we happily belong having always been, and we trust always will be, ‘to fear God, and honour the king, and to meddle not with them that are given to change.’ We beg leave humbly to offer our hearty thanks for your majesty’s most gracious expression of regard and affection towards the united church of England and Ireland, as by law established, and for your royal solicitude for its protection and welfare ; and, as in duty bound, we pray that it may please God to bless, preserve, and prosper your majesty long to reign over us ; and that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations, &c. (Signed) George Gleig, LL.D. bishop of Brechin ; Alexander Jolly, D.D. bishop of Moray ; Patrick Corry, D.D. bishop of Dunkeld and Dunblane ; William Skinner, D.D. bishop of Aberdeen ; David Low, LL.D. bishop of Ross and Argyle ; James Walker, D.D. bishop of Edinburgh¹.”

IN THE BODY OF CHRIST, when “one member suffers, all the members suffer with it” by sympathy ; and this feeling was powerfully excited by the merciless persecution which the reformed catholic clergy of Ireland suffered at the hands of the popish priests and their infuriated people. An address of sympathy, and a collection, were sent from the church in Scotland to her sister church of Ireland, which was thankfully acknowledged by the archbishop of Armagh. It must be named to their credit, that the presbyterian synod of Aberdeen also sent an address and subscription in aid of the literally *starving* clergy of Ireland.

IN JUNE THIS YEAR, the annual meeting of the clergy of the united diocese of Edinburgh, Fife, and Glasgow, was held in St. Paul’s Church, when the Rev. E. B. Ramsay preached an eloquent sermon in favour of the Gaelic Episcopal Society, but the collection was very small. The following editorial remarks upon Mr. Ramsay’s sermon having suggested the formation of the SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOCIETY, they are here cited :—“The misfortune is, that the Gaelic Society is not sufficiently fashionable. It is too near home to be interesting. There are frequent appeals made for distant and unknown charities, when clergy from a distance appear as their advocates, and preach eloquent sermons. A host of speakers add their persuasions, and the collections are liberal, a great

part of which go to pay the preachers' travelling expenses. But here are our own flesh and blood, men who lift up the same holy hands, breathe the same air, are of the same household of faith, join in the same sacraments, and use the same sacred liturgy, with ourselves. When called on to make contributions to foreign missions we unite with independents, baptists, and presbyterians; whereas these poor highlanders are strictly an integral part of our own church, who are perishing for lack of spiritual food in the very centre of plenty. In giving to this society, the benevolence of the public is not intercepted by a long line of secretaries, presidents, collectors, Jews, Turks, infidels, &c.; for on the part of the office-bearers it is a 'labour of love.' These highland episcopalians 'meet under the open canopy of heaven and the moist shade of Ben Nevis;' and they are in such poor circumstances, that *three or four pence* a week is all that a congregation can contribute for the support of their clergyman. A priest who has laboured in the Lord's vineyard for fifty-six years had only *thirty shillings per annum*! and for this sum he served *two* cures! Others serve three cures on similar pittances! The present venerable bishop of Ross and Argyle has administered the sacred rite of confirmation in the open air, with the heath-clad mountain for an altar-piece. For want of that fostering care which might be so easily bestowed, a large population of genuine episcopalians 'are rapidly merging into the mass of the people;' whereas a small contribution would revive the old tastes and former recollections of thousands who are compelled by our neglect to seek such meagre comfort as they can find in the establishment. These perishing souls will rise in judgment against us. Their blood will be on our heads, and will be required at our hands. At the awful day of assize they will upbraid us with having suffered the god of this world to steel our hearts against their clamorous wants. They have appealed to us as countrymen, as children of the same holy mother, washed in the same laver of regeneration, and fed with the same bread of life. But some of us had gone to our merchandize, it was too early in the morning for others, there were no accounts of conversions with which to entertain others, and these poor episcopalians were not romantic enough for others. We submit, with humility, that to secure a tolerable sum *a collection should be made in every chapel in the kingdom on a Sunday*¹."

THE WRITER OF THIS, in a subsequent number, also made

¹ Episcopal Magazine, iii. 222, 223.

The following remarks :—“ It has often occurred to us that an annual collection in *every* chapel in the kingdom [of Scotland] might be worthy of the attention of our venerable governors. They are now as much entitled as Timothy was to ‘charge them who are rich in this world, that they be ready to give, and glad to distribute.’ As St. Paul advised to lay up something on the first day of the week according to our prosperity, might not the first *Sunday* of every new year be devoted to that purpose? Let each congregation give according to their ability, and let the whole be remitted to a lay treasurer, under the inspection of the bishops. Then this fund could be made available for church building, church repairs, and, when there is no demand of this sort upon it, let a part be applied to making out the scanty incomes of the clergy. . . . We reckon there are at least 100,000 episcopalians in Scotland; and were each to give but *one shilling* on the annual collection day, a sum of £5000 annually might be raised. Collections have this advantage, that *every one* has an opportunity of contributing something according to his ability, no matter though it be but two mites that make a farthing, whereas many men are ashamed to subscribe on paper what they can afford to give, especially as the humble sum of one may stand next to a larger sum given by a more wealthy or a more ostentatious subscriber. . . . Let it be tried for one year, and we venture to predict that the collection will be so liberal as to establish the custom in all time coming¹.” The trial was happily made soon after this was written, and a much larger sum was raised than the sum above prognosticated. He also suggested the formation of a society on similar principles in England for the augmentations of the poor vicarages, the livings of which are a disgrace to a christian nation, but particularly to the impropiators of the tithes.

AFTER DIVINE SERVICE, the Society adjourned to the theological class-room in Hill Street, when Mr. Fergusson, from Glasgow, stated there were nearly 10,000 episcopalians in that city, the greater proportion of whom were artizans and labourers, who had neither places of worship nor clergymen to minister to them, and consequently were in danger of being lost to the church. The returns made by the Gaelic clergy in the diocese of Ross and Argyle “shew a gross amount of about 3000 persons avowing themselves to be conscientiously episcopalians. These are but the *scanty remnant of a host*, who, within the memory of aged men yet living, were members of

¹ Episcopal Magazine. vol. v. 348. 1837.

bytery refused to sustain the call; that is, to ordain and induct him. Mr. Young appealed to the Assembly, and the appeal came this year before that court; but the presbytery's sentence was affirmed on the motion of lord Moncrief. The presbytery now rejected Mr. Young, and intimated their decision to lord Kinnoul, who appealed to the synod of Perth; but his lordship abandoned that appeal, and commenced an action in the court of session, on account of the *illegality* of the veto of the parishioners, and of the injury done to his lordship's patrimonial rights. The presbytery denied the jurisdiction of the court of session in this instance, as the process of admission was within the sole jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts, which they said were not subject to the review of any civil court; and declared that the mandate of the civil court would not be obeyed, nor could that court enforce obedience¹. In this state of mutual defiance the commission thought proper to order a general fast to be observed all over the kingdom, to bewail the kirk's "sins of omission and commission and the long preservation of errors in doctrine and discipline in the bosom of the church, and by which it has long and grievously suffered in its purity and efficiency as a christian church." The government winked at this insolent assumption of the royal authority; but as the government neither authorised nor enforced it, and as the episcopalians had nothing to do with the sins of the kirk, they paid no attention to the orders of the commission. In one of the largest assemblages of the commission, a resolution was passed expressive of the strongest distrust in the constitution and character of the commission that had been issued by his majesty's ministers, for inquiring into the state of the kirk, grounded on the fact that a majority of the acting and paid commissioners were known to be unfriendly to her; and that one of them, who was their secretary, conducted the opposition to the payment of the ministers' cess in Edinburgh².

1836.—THE WARM SYMPATHIES of the reformed catholic church of Scotland were engaged for the cruel persecution of her sister in Ireland, at the hands of the ungrateful papists, whose avowed object was to *starve out* the Irish clergy. Bishop Walker and his clergy sent an address to the archbishop of Armagh, expressing, in glowing language, their sympathy for the sufferings of the Irish clergy. The archbishop, in reply, says, that "the bright example which the episcopal church of Scotland has exhibited to the christian

¹ Hetherington's History, 240-242.—Dublin Review, 79-84.
British Magazine for 1835, p. 358.

World, of devotedness to the cause of its divine Master, amidst the greatest discouragements, will not be lost on your Irish Brethren." The primus, and his brethren the bishops, with their clergy, also sent an address to the Irish primate, in which they say,—“By your patience—by your unwavering adhesion to the cause of gospel truth—by your continued and faithful execution of the trust which our common master hath committed to your keeping—ye have deserved, and ye have earned, the respect of the whole christian world. . . . Brethren, it hath pleased divine Providence so to order our worldly matters, that, except by the prayers which we offer up in your behalf, our ability to serve you is small; but the little which we can do, we will endeavour, God being our helper, to do effectually. We have exhorted our several congregations to contribute, as far as their means will allow, towards the alleviation of your immediate distress, and we will transmit the amount of the collections thus made, with as little delay as possible, to your venerated primate.” In reply to this, the archbishop of Armagh said,—“With pride and exultation do we acknowledge your claim to be accounted one with us in doctrine, in worship, in discipline; in all, in short, that constitutes and adorns a true and apostolic member of Christ’s holy catholic church. The evils brought upon the ministers of the Irish branch of the united church, by a sudden and almost total suspension of income, entailing pecuniary embarrassments of the severest kind, and the disappointment of well-founded hopes, by harassing and combined opposition to legal claims—by personal insecurity and actual outrage—by expulsion from their parishes, and the destitution of their families—by unceasing clamours, and the most unjust accusations—are far greater than can be represented in any general exposition of suffering. By none better than yourselves will the nature and extent of these sufferings be understood¹.”

A LARGE SUM was collected in Edinburgh and remitted to Ireland, and bishop Walker, writing to a friend, says, “I had a letter, a few days ago, from a friend who lately passed two months in Ireland, from which I send you an extract, which, at this time especially, is worthy of being generally known:—‘The endeavour *to starve out* the protestant clergy, I hope, will prove as vain as it is dreadful. The noble subscriptions raised in this country will, I trust, relieve immediate distress, and enable them to keep their ground, and their flocks together, until better times and better feelings arise. The

¹ Episcopal Magazine, iv. 61, 62.

protestant clergy in Ireland are a very devoted set of men generally, and one who told me he had only received eighteen pounds for a year and a quarter (a poor curate), added, Never mind; while there is a loaf of bread and a stream of water, we shall hope still to do God's work.' This spirit, I know, from the best sources of information, is general among those men who, under the severest pressure of temporal privations, yet possess the true riches, of which their persecutors cannot deprive them¹." The following extract from the bishop of Edinburgh to the Irish primate is alike honourable to the clergy and to the episcopalian laity, and stands in bright contrast to the unnatural and antichristian conduct of the fierce voluntaries, that were moving heaven and earth to overturn that very establishment from which they had seceded. "In Scotland even, as well as in Ireland, the same unnatural and unholy league, under the name of *voluntaries*, menaces the established church to an extent and by means which no man would have believed five years ago. From that church we dissent on high conscientious grounds. But I have great satisfaction in being able to state distinctly, that both our clergy and laity have ever supported, and continue to support, the established church in all her just and legal rights, which, so far as circumstances have yet permitted, have been opposed and assailed by other communities in a very intemperate and unchristian manner. The established clergy do us justice in this respect; and in Edinburgh they have united with us very cordially in the humble efforts which we have made to raise subscriptions for the suffering church of Ireland, which they justly feel, as we all must feel, is the first only of those legal institutions which it is sacrilegiously proposed to proscribe²."

THERE WERE A NUMBER of young men ordained this year, to both the inferior orders of the ministry, in the dioceses of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Dunkeld. The new church in Glasgow, for the benefit of the working people there, was commenced to be built, and Mr. Aitchison himself headed the subscription with the munificent sum of £300. The archbishop of Canterbury subscribed handsomely, and all the Scottish bishops subscribed liberally out of their limited incomes. Bishop Walker held a confirmation in St. John's church, when a hundred and twenty-four young people of both sexes, belonging to Edinburgh alone, were sealed with the holy spirit of promise, which was the earnest of their inheri-

¹ Episcopal Magazine, iv. 63.

² Ibid. 9 j.

tance. Among these were seventeen young men from the Cavalry barracks, in their uniforms. A meeting of the Gaelic society was held in May, and in the report by Mr. Ramsay, the secretary, the advantage was shewn which this society had already conferred on the church. One young man, whose education had been defrayed by it, was to be ordained in the course of the summer, and his stipend to be supplied from its funds. Episcopacy was now flourishing and increasing in that very district which had formerly been the scene of its greatest persecution. Bishop Walker confirmed at the new congregation at Ayr, consecrated a burial-ground at Fairfield, near that town, at the special request of the proprietor, and licensed the formation of a congregation at Maybole, in the same county. Sixty-six heads of families, chiefly Irish protestants, applied for a clergyman, and stating "they were strangers in a strange land; and they may literally say that they have hung their harps upon the willows, when they think upon Zion." The foundation of a new church at Peebles, where there had been no episcopal place of worship since the Revolution, was laid with masonic honours. In August the foundation of Christ Church, Glasgow, was laid by Mr. Sheriff Alison, the historian of Europe. There was a masonic procession from St. Andrew's chapel, accompanied by an escort of dragoons and their band. After the ceremony, Mr. Alison addressed the Lodges and others present. He referred to those days, not long distant, when the episcopalians were a small but faithful band, performing the solemn rites of their church with as much privacy as possible. He now rejoiced to witness the rapid increase of that ancient apostolic church. He rejoiced to see the splendid donations of the rich, joined to the mite of the poor, cast into one common stock, for the erection of a temple where the poor would have the gospel preached unto them; and he rejoiced that those days of bigotry were gone, when the episcopalians of Glasgow and of Scotland would have shrunk, in the dread of personal violence, from the open display of a pageantry like the present¹.

THE STATED TRIENNIAL general meeting of the "Scottish Episcopal Friendly Society," was held at Aberdeen on the 13th of July, when, by the excellent management of the bishops and the clerical office-bearers, the increase during the last three years was found to be £2923 6s. 3d.; and the governors were now enabled to add £5 to the widows' annuities, and the sum of £50 to the provision for orphans. After this time, widows

¹ Episcopal Magazine, iv. *passim*.

have received £25, and orphans a bonus of £250. Christ's Church, Glasgow, contains school-rooms underneath, which can accommodate 300 children of the working class of episcopalians, who, amidst sectarians of every description, have preserved their integrity, and their children now receive a sound religious education in the principles of the church¹.

1837.—THIS YEAR APPLICATION was made to Dr. Low, bishop of Ross and Argyle, by the neglected episcopalians of the isle of Skye, for the erection of a church and the settling of a priest in their island. Bishop Low sent his own curate among them, to ascertain their numbers and disposition; and he found "many families, and a number of individuals scattered here and there, who are sounder churchmen, and better versed in our tenets, than in many other parts where they are blessed with the ministry of a clergyman." They had been in the habit of reading the liturgy for themselves; most of them never had before seen a clergyman—so that they were churchmen *by tradition*, as it were. Thankfully, therefore, did they assemble together during the three or four months that Mr. Oldfield remained among them; and they received the Lord's Supper with the greatest satisfaction and comfort. "Many children were baptized, amongst whom were several whose parents were not of our communion, who had been refused that ordinance by their own pastor, upon very groundless, unsatisfactory, and arbitrary reasons." In the same diocese, a new and much larger church was begun to be built in Inverness, on the site of the old one, when subscriptions were obtained to the amount of nearly £1700; one item of which was from a distinguished member of the University of Oxford, under the title of "A Friend to the Episcopal Church in Scotland," for the munificent sum of £600. The number of young persons belonging to the city of Edinburgh confirmed this year was a hundred and thirteen. On the 19th of April, bishop Walker consecrated the newly built church at Peebles, when seven young persons were also confirmed, and the holy communion was administered. A great many presbyterians were attracted by the novelty of the office; but they conducted themselves with the greatest propriety. In the diocese of Aberdeen, the Errol schools in the parish of Cruden, which are in full connection with the national schools in England, were examined by the rev. John B. Pratt, the incumbent, and several of the clergy of the diocese. The boys and girls acquitted themselves very much to the satisfaction of the examiners. The

¹ Episcopal Magazine, iv. 288-412.

report of the Gaelic Society, this year, shews that there were three schools, containing on the average 300 scholars, in full operation ; and that the testimony borne by the clergy, and others, to the zeal and good conduct of the teachers, was extremely satisfactory. The Christian Knowledge Society contributed largely towards the erection of the church in the Isle of Skye, the foundation of which was laid on the 17th of May, with the greatest solemnity, and amidst "tears of joy" of many venerable and aged highlanders, who had congregated from all parts of the island, and from some of the adjacent islands, to witness this interesting ceremony ¹.

IN THE MONTH of May, the bishop of Brechin, now in his eighty-fifth year, resigned the office of Primus. His extraordinary mental exertions had impaired his health, and rendered him incapable of the duties of his high office. Together with bodily infirmity, he was also afflicted with the loss of hearing to a considerable degree, from which cause he was unable to preside in a general synod of the church. He was born in the town of Stonehaven, and received his degree of M.A. at King's College, in the University of Aberdeen. The consecration of bishop Seabury drew him into notice as a public writer, in the defence of his native church from the calumnious attack of an English dissenter. His defence was so triumphant, that the editor, under the assumed name of *Sylvanus Urban*, said of him, in a note,—“ We think the correspondence of this learned writer an honour, and shall be happy in the continuance of it. *Sit anima nostra cum sua.*” The Scotch Catholic church was, at the time of his resignation, in a more prosperous state than it had been since the last severe persecution, yet no efforts were made by her governors, either individually or collectively, to extend her borders, by drawing their former oppressors into the fold of Christ. In the last generation the presbyterians would not hear the charmers, notwithstanding the wisdom of their charming ; and besides, there was then really personal danger in speaking the truth, even in love. This produced a timidity which seems to have clung to the church like her evil genius ; and men are now so *liberal*, that they will not proselytise the semi-heathen, by whom they are surrounded, lest they should *give offence* to the establishment. But offences must come, and those who are more afraid of offending their fellow-men, who are in a sinful state of revolt from Christ's church, than zealous of extending His kingdom, cannot be considered as worthy of Him. There were no restrictions, of either policy or expediency, placed upon

¹ Episcopal Magazine, ii. *passim*.

the apostles, when they received their commission to disciple all nations ; neither ought there to be any on their successors, who act under the same commission, to withhold them from extending the blessing of the apostolic doctrine and fellowship to their own countrymen. The apostles, and other apostolic men, knew that martyrdom awaited their exertions to convert those who had been predestinated unto the adoption of children ; and why should the Catholic bishops of Scotland neglect the active conversion of those whom, we pray God, for Christ's sake, may yet re-obtain an inheritance, having, we hope, been predestinated, after a long and sinful state of revolt, according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the council of His own will? Had bishop John Skinner been actuated by a spirit of the fear of giving offence, there might have been a schismatical communion in Scotland to this day. His success might incite the clergy to recover their countrymen from darkness to the enlightenment of the eyes of their understandings, "that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, may give unto them the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him."

PRINCIPALS ROBERTSON AND HILL, AND DR. INGLIS, had succeeded, by good management, in moderating the fierce zeal of presbytery, and in bringing the General Assemblies to a more rational disposition than many of those were after the Revolution. But the genuine spirit of presbytery had all along a considerable number of representatives in the Assembly, and their strength and numbers had gone on progressively increasing since the secession of the Erskines. At the period at which we are now arrived, the true presbyterian, or ultra-Calvinistic party, had gained complete ascendancy in the Assemblies, and had driven consistency, moderation, and common sense, out of doors. There is an exact parallel betwixt the real, genuine ultra-presbyterian, and the jesuits ; for whenever either party arrives at uncontrolled power, they are sure to precipitate measures so rapidly and rashly, as to bring on a crisis. In every period of the history of presbytery, triumphant success has produced a re-action, and "right-hand backslidings and left-hand defections" have immediately precipitated the kirk from the summit of her glory. The Veto Act was the triumph of the ultra party, and its effect has been the "disruption" of more than one-third of the kirk, after they found they had a firmer government to deal with than any of the preceding administrations, since the days of Melville.

CHAPTER LXXXI.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JAMES WALKER, D.D.,
BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1837.—Election of the Primus.—Address to Bishop Walker.—Death of King William.—Opening of the church at Alloa.—Bishop Torry resigns St. Peter's church.—Addresses to the Queen and to the Queen Dowager.—Answers.—Episcopal synod.—Dr. Moir elected to Brechin.—Dr. Russell elected to Glasgow.—Ordinations.—Consecration of bishops Russell and Moir.—Rev. R. Montgomery.—Bishop of Nova Scotia.—Lord Kinnoul's action at law.—1838.—Decision of the Court of Session—this case brought before the Assembly—its decision.—Appeal to the House of Lords.—Isle of Skye.—Confirmation.—Synods.—A fast.—Death of bishop Jolly—character—his published works.

1837.—IMMEDIATELY on the resignation of bishop Gleig, Dr. Jolly, the bishop of Moray, assumed the temporary office of Primus, agreeably to the second Canon, and he summoned the bishops to meet at Aberdeen, for the election of a new Primus. Those bishops whose health permitted them met accordingly in St. Andrews' church, Aberdeen, on Wednesday, the 24th of May: there were present the bishops of Aberdeen, Dunkeld and Dunblane, and Ross and Argyle. After prayers the bishop of Edinburgh was proposed, for whom the bishop of Ross and Argyle voted, and produced proxies from the late Primus and from the bishop of Moray; the bishops of Aberdeen, and Dunkeld and Dunblane, were dissentient, and voted *pro forma* for each other. The right reverend Dr. Walker was therefore duly elected to the office of Primus Scotiæ Episcopus, an honour deservedly conferred on him, on account of his talents, and the high character which he sustained as a Biblical scholar and a most learned theologian.

THE ANNUAL SYNOD of the united diocese of Dunkeld and Dunblane was held in the church of Forfar, on the 7th of

¹ Episcopal Magazine, v. 223.

June, when, in the absence of bishop Torry, the very reverend John Skinner, dean of the united dioceses, presided. On a comparison of the clergy's lists with their returns last year, there was found to be a considerable increase in the number of communicants. The synod drew up and transmitted the following congratulatory address to the new Primus:—"Right Reverend Sir,—Permit us, the dean and clergy of the united diocese of Dunkeld and Dunblane, in provincial synod assembled, to congratulate you on your recent elevation to the chief seat on the episcopal bench of Scotland. We doubt not, right reverend sir, that you are impressed with an eager desire to improve the condition and discipline of that portion of the church of Christ with which we and our flocks are connected, and that, with time and talent at your command, you will unceasingly devote yourself to that object, and thus, under God, be the instrument of placing our little Zion in that rank in the christian world, to which the soundness of her principles, and the pious adherence of her bishops and clergy to 'the apostles' doctrine and fellowship,' so justly entitle her. Devoutly praying that you, right reverend sir, may have from above such strength and power bestowed upon you, as shall enable you to fulfil the expectations which we, in common with our brethren throughout the church, do fondly cherish in your behalf,—We have the honour to remain, your reverence's faithful sons and servants, &c.—(Signed), John Skinner, dean¹."

ON TUESDAY morning, June 20th, at twelve minutes past two o'clock, King William IV. expired at Windsor Castle, in the seventy-second year of his age, and the seventh of his reign. This event caused an universal feeling of regret and sorrow throughout the empire; for he was much endeared to his people by the deep interest which he took in their welfare, as well as by the manly virtues which adorned his character. He was the third son of George III., and entered the naval service as a midshipman in 1779. He served in the great naval battle of the 1st of June, under Admiral Rodney, with the Spanish fleet, under Don Juan de Langara, who exclaimed, on being steered by prince William, in his boat, on board lord Rodney's ship—"Well may England be mistress of the ocean, when the sons of her king are thus employed in her service²."

ON THE FEAST OF St. John Baptist, the Primus ordained Mr. John Hunter, who was a convert from presbytery; and he was ap-

¹ *Episcopal Magazine*, v. 224.

² *Ibid.* 231-236.

pointed to serve at that church in Alloa which had been the scene of good bishop Alexander's ministrations. This church had been shut up for fifteen years, and it was solemnly re-opened on the 28th of June, by the very reverend Dr. Russell, dean of the united diocese. Bishop Torry resigned the pastoral charge of St. Peter's chapel, Peterhead, and it again reverted to the jurisdiction of its proper diocesan, the bishop of Aberdeen. It is much to be regretted, that the Scottish bishops are obliged to serve at the altar as the incumbents of chapels, on account of the poverty of the church, and there being so little provision made for the support of their rank in the church. In July the bishops agreed to an address to the queen, and at the same time an address of condolence to the queen dowager, on the death of the late king:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,—We, your majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, in our own names, and in the name and behalf of the reverend clergy and christian people of our communion, entreat permission to express, with the sincerest respect and sympathy, our feelings of condolence on the death of our late illustrious and revered sovereign, your majesty's royal uncle. At the same time, we beg leave, with every sentiment of respectful duty, to add our sincere and heartfelt congratulations on your majesty's happy accession to the imperial crown of this united kingdom. We most fervently pray to Him by whom kings reign and princes decree justice, that your majesty may long wear that crown, which, in the dispensation of God's good providence, has now descended to you, in health, happiness, and honour; and that your majesty may long reign over us in peace and prosperity, the revered, and respected, and beloved sovereign of a free, an united, and a loyal people. May God, who is the source and support of all just authority, be your majesty's guide in council, and your sure support in all the arduous duties of the high office to which in His providence He has called you. Such, in the name and mediation of our divine Redeemer, is, and will ever continue to be, the fervent and dutiful prayer of—may it please your majesty—your majesty's most obedient, faithful, and loyal subjects and servants.—James Walker, bishop of Edinburgh, and Primus."

LORD JOHN RUSSELL informed the "bishop of Edinburgh" that the above address was very graciously received by her majesty. The bishops also sent the following address of condolence to her majesty the queen dowager:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,—We, the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, beg leave, with the sincerest respect and sympathy, to present to your majesty the expression of our heartfelt condolence on the death of our late illustrious, revered, and beloved sovereign, your majesty's royal husband; in which expression of respectful sympathy we are certain that the reverend clergy and christian people of our communion cordially concur. We feel, and the nation universally feels, the sincerest respect and gratitude towards your majesty, not only as the affectionate consort of our beloved king, but as his constant, kind, and faithful attendant during the distressing and painful sufferings of his last days. Most earnestly do we pray, that God, who, in the dispensations of his good providence, has at this time visited your majesty and the nation with this affliction, may bless your majesty, and grant you that christian consolation under it which He alone can bestow. With this fervant prayer, and with sentiments of the sincerest christian sympathy, we remain, with all dutiful respect—may it please your majesty—your majesty's most humble, most obedient, and most faithful servants."

IN REPLY TO THIS affectionate address, an answer was received from lord Howe, dated Bushy House, July 17th:—"Right Reverend Gentlemen,—I have not failed to submit the address of kind condolence from the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church to queen Adelaide, and I am honoured by her majesty's commands to express how consolatory to the queen dowager's feelings has been this proof of attachment to herself, and of respect for the memory of the late king¹."

ON THE 9th of August an episcopal synod was held in the house of the Primus in Edinburgh, preparatory to a general synod of the church, for the purpose of revising the Canons. In conformity with a mandate from the Primus, the clergy of the diocese of Brechin met at Montrose, on St. Bartholomew's day, and elected the REV. DAVID MOIR, incumbent of St. Andrew's church, in the city of Brechin, to be bishop coadjutor, and successor to Dr. Gleig, the bishop of that see, who was disqualified for his episcopal duties by age and many infirmities. The episcopal synod above mentioned severed the bishoprick of Glasgow from that of Edinburgh; and the Primate sent his mandate to the dean and clergy of Glasgow, authorising them to meet, and to elect a bishop for that see. Their choice fell on Dr. Russell, of St. Janus' church, Leith,

¹ Episcopal Magazine, v. 288.

then dean of Edinburgh. On the 31st of August the foundation stone of St. John's church, Inverness, was laid, with due religious solemnity, by the very reverend Charles Fyvie, the incumbent, and dean of the diocese of Ross and Argyle, in the presence of the provost and magistrates of the burgh, and an immense assemblage of the curious. Mr. Fyvie was appointed, by her majesty's government, chaplain to the garrison of Fort George, about twelve miles distant from his cure. He officiates at his own church on Sundays, at eleven in the forenoon, and at six in the evening, and at the garrison at two o'clock. On the 23d of August the annual diocesan synod of Aberdeen assembled, when Mr. James Christie, the author of the Vindication of the Oblation and Invocation in the Scottish Communion Office, and Mr. John Moir, son of the bishop elect of Brechin, were admitted to the holy order of priests¹.

THE CONSECRATION of Dr. Russell to the see of Glasgow, and of Dr. Moir as coadjutor to the bishop of Brechin, the former Primus, took place in St. John's church, Edinburgh, on the 8th of October, being the twentieth Sunday after Trinity, by the right reverend Dr. Walker, bishop of Edinburgh, and Primus, assisted by Dr. Skinner, bishop of Aberdeen, and Dr. Low, bishop of Ross and Argyle. The Rev. E. B. Ramsay, the incumbent of St. John's, preached an appropriate sermon, in which he maintained the necessity of the episcopal succession, and called it "the golden chain," reaching from Christ to the present day. He explained the distinctive differences between the catholic church and the Romish schism, and the anti-episcopal establishment by which she is surrounded; shewing wherein they have both erred, and that the reformed Catholic church of Scotland has preserved the great doctrines of christianity in the greatest purity. The choir sang the Hallelujah chorus from the Messiah with great effect, and the holy communion was administered according to the Scottish communion office, as it is directed by the twenty-first Canon, being of "*primary authority* in this church." In the afternoon the lord bishop of Glasgow preached, wherein he strongly exhorted his hearers to adhere steadily to the faith once delivered to the saints, since our pardon and entrance into the heavenly state of bliss and perfection has been procured by so merciful and effectual a method as the death of Christ.

BISHOP WALKER appointed the Rev. C. H. Terrott, of St. Paul's church, dean of Edinburgh, in the place of Dr. Russell,

¹ Episcopal Magazine, v. 320.

now bishop of Glasgow. Permission was given for the erection of a fourth episcopal church at Glasgow, to be called St. Jude's, provided it was erected at the distance of not less than half a mile from the site of any of the others; and that the Rev. Robert Montgomery, the incumbent, should engage to serve that cure for the certain space of three years; in the meantime he officiated in a large hall in Buchanan Court. Mr. Alexander Cumming, farmer at Craigherbs, near Mill of Boyndie, Banffshire, while ploughing, turned up a small stone, on which some engraving appeared, which, on examination, was supposed to be the seal of archbishop Sharp, of St. Andrews, as it bore his family arms in conjunction with those of the see, with the legend *Jacobus Episcopus Sancti Andre*¹. Bishop Walker held an ordination, in St. John's church, on St. Thomas's day, when Mr. Suther and Mr. Hunter were ordained priests. On that occasion the right reverend Dr. John Inglis, bishop of Nova Scotia, was admitted within the altar rails, when the holy communion was administered; and on Sunday, the 24th of December, the bishop of Nova Scotia preached in the same church, and afterwards confirmed four young persons. The bishop of Edinburgh authorised a general thanksgiving to be observed throughout his diocese, on Innocents' day, for the blessing of the late abundant harvest.

THE SUIT, COMMENCED by lord Kinnoul and Mr. Young, his presentee, in the Court of Session in 1835, was argued in the presence of thirteen judges, for ten days, in the latter end of this year; but it was not decided till March next year. The kirk denied the jurisdiction of the Court of Session; nevertheless, she was obliged to defend this action. Although it was attempted to be made appear that the court assumed the power of compelling presbyteries to ordain, yet this was a purely civil action, called an "action of declarator," against the members of the presbytery, the heritors of the parish, and the collectors of the widows' fund, for the purpose of having it found that Mr. Young "had been legally, validly, and effectually presented to the church and the parish of Auchterarder." In consequence, "that the presbytery were bound to take him upon trials, and if found by them to be properly qualified, then to receive and admit him as minister of the said kirk; that their refusal to do so was illegal, and injurious to him, and that if they should still persist in refusing him, that the stipend, manse, and glebe, and all other emoluments connected with the kirk and parish, should be declared to belong

¹ Episcopal Magazine, v. 349-352.

and be paid to him by the heritors during the whole term of his life; and that in the event of this being so found, that even the trustees of the fund established by statute for behoof of the widows and children of the ministers of the kirk of Scotland [to whom, in cases of delay in collating to a vacant kirk, it is payable] had no right to interfere with the fruits of the said living: or that the said stipend and emoluments should be paid by lord Kinnoul, the patron, during Mr. Young's life: and concluding for the costs of the suit¹."

1838.—THE LORDS OF SESSION took seven days to deliver their opinions in the Auchterarder case, and only decided by majority of three, on the 10th of March, of eight to five, that the matters at issue were within their jurisdiction; that the patron, having validly presented, the suit was competent against the presbytery, who were bound to take the presentee to trials; and that by refusing to do so, and rejecting him on the sole ground that a majority of male heads of families in connection with the kirk dissented, they had acted *illegally*, in violation of their duty, to the detriment of the plaintiffs, and contrary to the provisions of the statutes, more particularly that of Queen Anne."

At the next meeting of the presbytery of Auchterarder, the plaintiffs presented a memorial, requiring them to proceed with Mr. Young's trials, ordination, and inunction. The presbytery shifted the responsibility from themselves to the provincial synod, by referring the memorial to that court; when Mr. Young's law-agent took a protest against the presbytery, holding each of its members guilty, and severally liable to damages to the presentee for their refusal to take him to trials. From the synod the case came before the Assembly, which met as usual on the 17th of May, with lord Belhaven as the queen's representative, and Dr. Muir as moderator. The decision of the Court of Session had roused up the indignant feelings of the ultra anti-patronage party, and many overtures were sent up by the presbyteries calling upon the Assembly to pass a declaratory act, asserting the independence of the kirk from the civil power, as far as regarded her spiritual power, and her determination "to maintain and enforce it." Accordingly, on the 23d of May, Dr. Buchanan's, of Glasgow, "Resolution anent the independent jurisdiction of the church of Scotland," was carried by a majority of forty-one,—“That the General Assembly, while they unqualifiedly acknowledge the exclusive jurisdiction of the civil courts in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by law to the church, and will

¹ Dublin Review, No. xxvii. p. 85.

ever give and inculcate implicit obedience to their decisions there anent; DO RESOLVE, that, as is declared in the Confession of Faith of this national established church—‘The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church officers distinct from the civil magistrate;’ and that in all matters touching the doctrine, government, and discipline of this church, her judicatories possess an exclusive jurisdiction founded on the word of God, ‘which power ecclesiastical (. . . .) flows immediately from God and the Mediator Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, *not having a temporal head on earth*, but only Christ, the only spiritual king and governor of his kirk.’ And they do farther resolve, that this spiritual jurisdiction, and the supremacy and sole Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, on which it depends, they will assert, and at all hazards defend, by the help and blessing of that great God, who, in the days of old, enabled their fathers, amid manifold persecutions, to maintain a testimony, even to the death, for Christ’s kingdom and crown: and, finally, that they will firmly enforce submission to the same upon the office-bearers and members of this church, by the execution of her laws, in the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority wherewith they are invested¹.”

IN AN ECSTASY of delight, Hetherington exclaims, “by this *noble and truly presbyterian* motion, it was made evident that the church of Scotland had once more taken her position upon the ground so invincibly held by the reformers and martyrs of other days, and that the contest was for no trivial matter, but in maintenance of her allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, and in defence of His sole right to reign over His spiritual kingdom¹.” There are none so blind as those that will not see. At the very moment when they made the vain boast of having no temporal head on earth, the representative of their temporal head was present before their eyes, and listening to this renunciation of their allegiance. The Assembly authorised the presbytery of Auchterarder to appeal to the House of Lords against the decision of the Court of Session; and the presbytery appealed accordingly².

IT HAS ALREADY been mentioned that bishop Low had sent his curate to the Isle of Skye to gather a congregation; on the 11th of March this year he ordained Mr. William Greig, of King’s College, Aberdeen, and appointed him to the church that had been erected by the episcopalians of that Island. In April, bishop Russell officiated for the bishop of Edinburgh,

¹ Acts of Assembly, Session 6, p. 1085.

² History. 242.

³ Ibid. Dublin Review, No. xxvii. p. 86.

he was in very bad health, and confirmed 120 young persons, belonging entirely to the city of Edinburgh ; and he afterwards delivered an appropriate address in proof of the apostolic authority of this holy ordinance, and impressing on his young auditors the solemn nature of the obligations they had just taken on themselves. The diocesan synod of Aberdeen met on the 1st of May, being the feast of St. Philip and St. James, and took the code of canons into their consideration, with the view of such alterations or amendments as were to be proposed to the general synod of the church to be holden in Edinburgh in the month of August. The Rev. Patrick Cheyne was chosen to represent the diocese of Aberdeen at the general synod. On the 2d of May, the diocesan synod of Edinburgh was held in St. Paul's Church. Previous to their meeting, the Rev. George Drummond, of St. Mark's, Portobello, preached a sermon in behalf of the Gaelic Episcopal Society, when £21 only was collected. The synod met in the vestry, the very reverend dean Terrott in the chair ; and the Rev. E. B. Ramsay, of St. John's Church, was elected representative of the diocese in the ensuing synod. The new episcopal church of the Holy Trinity was opened for divine service on the first Sunday in July, making six episcopal churches in the city of Edinburgh, and another has been since projected.

As a sign of the times, and also of the spirit of presbytery, the established minister of Cromarty appointed Thursday, the 8th of June, to be the *fast day*, previous to his "Occasion" on the following Sunday. That day happened to be the queen's *coronation* day ; hence a day of rejoicing. His parishioners were much annoyed at this pharisaical proceeding of their minister, and besought him to postpone his sacrament for one week. As no entreaties could prevail on him to do so, there was a public meeting held of the citizens of Cromarty, when they passed the following resolutions :—"That the inhabitants of the town and county of Cromarty deprecate the conduct of the minister and kirk session of Cromarty, in fixing the day appointed for the coronation of her majesty, Queen Victoria, as a *fast day* preparatory to dispensing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. That it is highly unbecoming of any clergyman of the church of Scotland to appoint a day for a *fast* which had been previously set apart for all royal and patriotic subjects to celebrate the *coronation* of our beloved queen. That the inhabitants, &c. *will celebrate* the day of the queen's coronation by a *public dinner and procession*, accompanied with the usual demonstrations and

manifestations of joy and respect on her majesty's being crowned¹."

THE ANNUAL DIOCESAN synod of Brechin was holden on the 13th of August, when Mr. Alexander Simpson was ordained deacon, and appointed curate to the rev. Peter Jolly, of Lochlee, in that diocese. Mr. Jolly had been fifty-five years in the sacred ministry, and, from increasing infirmities, was unable to perform the duties of his cure. When lord Panmure heard of his intention, and knew his inability to spare any thing from his very small income, his lordship generously agreed to pay £10 per annum of Mr. Simpson's salary as curate. The synod directed their attention to the canons, with a view to the suggestion of alterations or additions for the consideration of the general synod, and elected the rev. William Henderson, incumbent of the episcopal church Arbroath, as the representative of the diocese. The rev. John Torry, of Cupar Angus, and son of bishop Torry, was appointed dean of the diocese of Dunkeld and Dunblane, vacant by the resignation of the very rev. John Skinner of Forfar, from increasing ill health².

THE DELICATE CONSTITUTION of the venerable bishop of Moray had been for some years gradually giving way, under the increasing infirmities of age; and he died on the feast of St. Peter, the 29th of June, in the eighty-third year of his age and the forty-second of his episcopate. A few days before his death, he seemed so visibly sinking that his friends prevailed with him to allow an attendant to watch by his bed-side during the night; but on the 28th, he felt himself so much better, that, after being assisted to bed, between nine and ten o'clock, he insisted upon being left alone for the night, directing his attendant to return next morning at seven. Upon entering the chamber at the appointed time, the attendant found the venerable man a lifeless corpse, with every feature and limb composed, as if in tranquil slumber, yet with some remarkable indications which shewed that the good man had not been insensible to the approach of dissolution, but had resigned himself to it consciously, with that calm and deep devotion for which he was through life distinguished. When his attendant entered his chamber he found him quite dead; but as his body was still warm, it is supposed that the soul had taken its everlasting flight about an hour before. He was discovered lying in the most placid and easy posture, with his hands

¹ Elgin Courant; cited in Ep. Mag. vi. 258.

² Ep. Mag. vi. 259, 260.

folded across his breast, and, from the serenity of his countenance, it is quite evident he had died without any struggle or convulsion. Death was to him but the removal of the veil which divided him from a world in which he had for years habitually dwelt in heart and mind." On Thursday, the 5th of July, his remains were deposited, according to his own desire, in the grave of his brother, in the churchyard of Turriff, in the presence of a numerous assemblage of the clergy and of the people of his late flock at Frasersburgh, as well as of the episcopal congregation of Turriff, of which he had in early life had the cure. The services were read by the bishop of Aberdeen, assisted by the very reverend James Walker, dean of Moray¹.

IN THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND each bishop has his share in the general government of the church; and in this respect bishop Jolly was a most valuable member of the episcopal College. "With profound learning, a clear head, and a sound judgment, he was never at fault; and when he had once made up his mind on any important question, he remained firm as a rock. I have known him," says his intimate friend, bishop Walker, "on more occasions than one or two, tried by argument in every shape, by influence, by ridicule, even under the name of *cunctator*, or the drag on the carriage wheel. Nothing, however, could move him. He ever stood steadily opposed to rash legislation and to novelties, however plausible, maintaining firmly, but mildly, that *cunctator* is a very necessary officer, especially among ecclesiastical legislators, and that a *drag* on the carriage-wheel is, in many circumstances, the only means of escaping very serious disasters. His constitution was never very strong; but, within less than two years of his death, he wrote me [bishop Walker] that he was as eager at his books, and was able to enjoy his work, as he called it, with as high a relish, as ever. With increasing feebleness, and occasional palpitations of the heart, his mind continued clear and unclouded to the last; and his anxiety for the church which he loved continued unabated. When it was determined to summon a general synod, in 1838, he expressed this anxiety repeatedly, in the short letters which he was then able to write; and when he was unable to use his own pen, he employed that of his assistant. I had, besides, a message from an excellent lay friend of the church. . . .

' The following is the substance of a conversation which took

¹ Notice by the Rev. P. Cheyne, in the Aberdeen Journal; and cited in Note to Rev. C. Pressly's Funeral Sermon, pp. 19-21, and in Episcopal Magazine, vi. 288-290.

place between bishop Jolly and myself, on Sunday last, the 24th instant [June]. . . . Tell him [bishop Walker] I am dying, getting weaker and weaker; and I trust to his taking care that things are so managed at the ensuing synod, that the principles of the church may be preserved entire, and in no way infringed upon¹."

IN 1826, A MR. CRAIG, who disturbed the peace of the church for several years, attempted to introduce the low Calvinistic and anti-catholic views of the sacrament of baptism, contrary to the uninterrupted teaching of the reformed catholic church of Scotland. On this important occasion, bishop Jolly published "A Friendly Address to the Episcopalians of Scotland on Baptismal Regeneration; shewing that it is the doctrine of Scripture, of the earliest and purest Christian Antiquity, and of the reformed Episcopal Church, as expressed in its Liturgy; attention to which is earnestly recommended, as the best guard against the dangerous deviations of modern times." This tract was followed by "Observations on the Sunday Services," published in 1828; and in 1831 he published "The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist, considered as it is the Doctrine of Holy Scripture, embraced by the Universal Church of the first and purest Times, by the Church of England and by the Episcopal Church in Scotland." The bishop had devoted a long life to the studies of his profession. The whole range of theology was open to him, but the scriptures in their original languages, and the writings of the fathers, were his familiar food;—these he had thoroughly digested. The result is partly exhibited in his valuable work on the Eucharist; of which one of the most learned divines of the age remarked, that "it reminded him so forcibly of the writings of the ancient fathers, that he could often have imagined that they were still speaking." Bishop Jolly "had lived with God and himself, and he died on the morning of the Feast of St. Peter, with none but God and good angels to witness his departure." His character "was formed upon the model of the primitive saints, not as being the result of studious imitation, but the fruit of the *same principles* cherished with a like earnestness and simplicity of purpose, and developed through the same means. It was the character so formed and exhibited that attracted to bishop Jolly a degree of reverence and affection which it is the lot of few men to enjoy. Few, indeed, have deserved to be so revered and beloved. The spirit of primitive and apostolic piety seemed

¹ Bishop Walker's Life of Bishop Jolly, 15-17.

o be revived in him. . . . He was a living example of the intrinsic beauty and attractiveness of religion, as it may be developed through the church system. It might, perhaps, be easy to find a divine as deeply learned, but seldom can the name of one be recorded who so thoroughly imbibed and exemplified the spirit of the blessed saints, whose works and history were the subjects of his study¹."

IN EVERY sphere of life a good man is a blessing to society. The light of his christian and holy conversation so shines before men, that they see his good works, and, with Divine help, they may follow his good example, to the glory of God. Although it is but a limited circle in which even the most exalted can move, yet the greatest or the least of men may be the minister of good to those within the influence of their example, either in the domestic circle, which they may fill with christian light, or in the world around them, which may be attracted by their holy conversation. The reformed catholic church of Scotland has such a pattern of the christian's course in bishop Jolly, who taught, by his example, that the righteous man is entirely God's workmanship in Christ, whom he is bound to glorify in his body, which is the temple of the holy Spirit. Although, with the exception of the treatises already mentioned, bishop Jolly carried all his theological learning to heaven, yet he left a bright example to the church, of humility, ardent piety, holiness of life, and self-denial. Next to the example of christian obedience and holiness, which he so eminently exhibited, his short treatises will furnish the sincere churchman with the true catholic doctrines of the two sacraments; and they will teach him to avoid the dangerous heresies of *cons-* or *transubstantiation*, on the one hand, and the no less presumptuous heresy on the other, that the sacraments are mere shadowy rites and ceremonies—dead ordinances, without spiritual reality in them.

¹ Mr. Cheyne's and Bishop Walker's Lives of Bishop Jolly, prefixed to his friendly Address and Sunday Services,—and the Notice of his Death.

CHAPTER LXXXII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JAMES WALKER, D.D.

BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1838.—Diocese of Moray.—Confirmations.—A national synod—preliminaries—revision of the canons—canon forty.—Cathedral of Caithness.—Christ Church, Glasgow.—Dr. Bell's school, Leith.—Trinity Church, Edinburgh.—Church Society—bishop Walker's address.—Bishop of Ross and Argyle.—Bishop of Glasgow.—Dean of Edinburgh.—Mr. Ramsay's sermon.—Commemoration of the rebel Assembly of 1638.—1839.—Diocese of Ross—voluntaries—their riotous conduct.—Church at Alloa—at Frasersburgh.—A bursary.—Church at Kirkcaldy.—Church Society—report—resolutions.—Bishop of Ross, Mr. Montgomery's, the dean of Edinburgh's, and other speeches.—Pastoral letter.—Auchterarder.—Parish of Lethendy.—Parish of Marnoch.—1840.—Queen's marriage.—Bishops' address.—Death of bishop Gleig.—Act to remove disabilities from the church.—Christian Knowledge Society.—Church in Banff.—Diocesan synods.—Trinity College.—New congregations.—St. Paul's, Aberdeen.—Church Society—bishop of Glasgow's speech.—Strathbogie.—Parish of Marnoch.—1841.—Dalkeith.—Dumfermline.—Glasgow.—Aberdeen.—Death of the primus—character.—Remarks.

1838.—ON THE DEATH of the last bishop of Moray, that diocese was reunited to Ross and Argyle, a measure that had been agreed upon at the episcopal synod held in Edinburgh on the 9th of August, 1837, and with bishop Jolly's own full consent. There were at that time only four congregations in the diocese of Moray, none of which were numerous; Inverness, which had been united to Ross, on account of bishop Macfarlane's residence, and his being the incumbent of St. John's Church there, now reverted to the diocese of Moray. The clergy petitioned the primus for permission to elect a bishop for their now vacant diocese; but the resolution of the synod was carried into effect. The united dioceses elected the Rev. Charles

rie, of St. John's, Inverness, to be their representative at ensuing general synod. The bishop of Aberdeen confirmed Trinity Church, Elgin, twenty-six persons, most of whom of mature age. In July, bishop Low visited his extensive diocese; he ordained Mr. Alexander Ewing, and confirmed twenty-six young persons, at Inverness, eleven at the Isle of Skye, forty-two at Appin, eleven at Fort William, eleven at Athnairn, sixteen at Arpafillie, seventeen at Dingwall and Shetland; in all one hundred and forty-two¹.

ON WEDNESDAY, the 29th of August, a general synod of the national church assembled in St. Paul's Church, Edinburgh. There were present—the right reverends James Walker, D.D. bishop of Edinburgh, and primus; Patrick Torry, D.D. bishop of Dunkeld, Dunblane, and Fife; William Skinner, D.D. bishop of Aberdeen; David Low, LL.D. bishop of Ross, Glenelg, and Moray; Michael Russell, LL.D. bishop of Glasgow; David Moir, D.D. bishop, coadjutor to George Gleig, D.D. bishop of Brechin, composing the upper chamber. The very reverends Heneage Horsley, dean of Brechin; John Hay, dean of Dunkeld, &c.; John Cumming, dean of Aberdeen; C. H. Terrott, dean of Edinburgh; William Routledge, of Glasgow²: the reverends William Henderson, representative of Brechin; G. G. Milne, of Dunkeld, &c.; Patrick Fyvie, of Aberdeen; Charles Fyvie, of Ross, &c.; E. B. Hay, of Edinburgh; William S. Wilson, of Glasgow, constituting the lower or second chamber.

MORNING PRAYERS were read by the Rev. John Sinclair, who was archdeacon of Middlesex. The bishops, in their robes, all seated within the rails of the altar; at the conclusion of the Litany, the primus delivered an earnest and impressive address suitable to the important occasion on which they were assembled, after which the holy communion, according to the rite of the national office, which is declared to be of primary authority in that church, was administered. At the conclusion of the service, the primus called on the deans and representatives of dioceses to produce their commissions, which were examined, and all sustained as valid. The primus then, in the most solemn manner, opened the synod in the name of the blessed Trinity; and declared it to be a lawful national council of the catholic church in Scotland, with all the power and authority which, by the commission of our Lord Jesus Christ, the canons of this church, belong to such assemblies. He

¹ Episcopal Magazine, vi. 292.

² The Dean of Ross was unable to attend from bad health.

concluded with suitable prayers for the direction and assistance of the Holy Spirit in their deliberations. The Rev. H. Horsley was unanimously chosen prolocutor of the second chamber, and his election was approved and confirmed by the bishops. The Rev. J. W. Fergusson, of St. Peter's Chapel, Edinburgh, was appointed clerk to the second chamber. The synod then adjourned till the following day at eleven o'clock, when it again met for the dispatch of business¹.

THE CANONS underwent a most careful and thorough revision; the consideration of each was seriously taken up by both chambers; and the amendments proposed by each diocese were fully discussed, and either approved, modified, or rejected, as their merits, after mature deliberation, seemed to require. Considerable alterations were made in the arrangement and wording of the canons, whilst several new ones were added, in order to enforce ecclesiastical discipline, and to insure regularity in the performance of all church offices. The most important of the new canons relate to bishops coadjutors—to the appointment and business of diocesan synods—general synods—to the legislative power of general synods—to the appointment of episcopal synods annually—to the conditions of appeal—to clergymen officiating publicly in any place without using the liturgy—and for the clergy and laity of this church being furnished from time to time with an accurate view of its state and condition by means of pastoral letters from the bishops. A very important canon, No. 40, was introduced, "For establishing and maintaining a society in aid of the church," which has since been found to answer well the purpose for which it was proposed:—"WHEREAS, in the primitive church, and by apostolic order, collections were made for the poorer brethren, and for the propagation of the gospel, it is hereby DECREED, that a similar practice shall be observed in the Scottish episcopal church. Nor ought the poverty of the church, nor of any portion of it, to be pleaded as an objection, seeing that the divine commendation is given equally to those who, from their poverty, give a little with cheerfulness, and to those who give largely of their abundance. For this purpose, a society, called 'The Scottish Episcopal Church Society,' shall be formed; the objects of which shall be—1st, to provide a fund for aged or infirm clergymen, or salaries for their assistants, and general aid for congregations struggling with pecuniary difficulties; 2dly, to assist candidates for the ministry in completing their theological studies; 3dly, to pro-

¹ Episcopal Magazine, vi. 332.

ide episcopal schoolmasters, books, and tracts, for the poor ;
thly, to assist in the formation or enlargement of diocesan
braries. To promote these important purposes, a certain
ay shall be fixed upon annually by every diocesan synod,
hen a collection shall be made in every chapel throughout
he diocese, and the nature and object of the society, in re-
erence to the existing wants of the church, shall be explained
o the people." The canons now revised, the synod " did, and
ereby DO, ADOPT and SANCTION the following revised and
mended code of canons, and declare them to be in future the
tated rules and regulations for preserving order and disci-
line in the said church in Scotland¹." The whole number of
he canons is forty-one.

THE DUCHESS-COUNTESS OF SUTHERLAND repaired the
ncient cathedral church of the diocese of Caithness, in the an-
ient city of Dornoch, " with a splendour which throws almost
very other presbyterian place of worship completely into the
hade," and at an expense to her grace of £6000. The length of
his splendid church, from east to west, is a hundred and eleven
et, and the breadth, at the transept, is eighty-four feet.
At the west end of this once sacred edifice the following in-
cription has been put up:—" This ancient cathedral having
allen into decay and ruin, was re-edified, decorated, and re-
tored to religious service, by Elizabeth, duchess and countess
f Sutherland, in the years 1835-6 and 7. *The Lord is in his
oly temple*, PSALM xi." A magnificent service of plate was
resented to the rev. David Aitchison, at a soirée held in the
chool-room attached to Christ Church, Glasgow, by the con-
regation, in testimony of their high esteem for him as their
astor, and for his unwearied exertions in promoting their
est interests. On Thursday, the 11th of October, the foun-
ation stone of the first school to be erected in Leith, under
he celebrated Dr. Bell's donation, was laid. The right rev.
he bishop of Glasgow, assisted by the established ministers,
he provost and the corporation of Leith, joined in procession;
he provost laid the foundation-stone with masonic honours, and
he bishop of Glasgow concluded the ceremony by invoking the
Divine blessing on the undertaking. The bishop of Edin-
burgh consecrated the burial ground, and granted his episcopal
icense to Trinity Church at the Dean Bridge. It deserves to
e noticed, that on Sunday, the 7th of October, the prince of
Jude attended divine service at St. John's episcopal church,

¹ The Code of Canons, &c. Canon 40, and Introduction, pp. 7, 8.

in Edinburgh, and paid particular attention to the service, with which he seemed to be perfectly familiar¹.

ON THE 4TH OF DECEMBER a meeting was held in the Hope-toun rooms, in Edinburgh, for the purpose of forming the SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOCIETY, as it had been authorised by the fortieth canon. There were present, the bishops of Edinburgh, primus, Glasgow, and Ross and Argyle; all the clergy of Edinburgh and the neighbourhood, with a number of the nobility and gentry, and many of the gentlemen of the Scottish bar. The right reverend the primus took the chair, and opened the meeting with prayers; and then said, "The object of the meeting for which they were now assembled was to establish this society; the first object of which will be to provide for its poor and decayed clergymen, or salaries to their assistants, and general aid for congregations struggling with pecuniary difficulties; to assist candidates for the ministry in completing their theological studies; to provide episcopal schoolmasters, and books and tracts for the poor; and, lastly, to assist in the formation or enlargement of diocesan libraries. Now the meeting was aware that these desirable objects were not to be obtained in their position, without a direct appeal being made to their benevolence for voluntary contributions. It was true these claims and others were frequent, but they were indispensably necessary; and they had high scriptural authority for enforcing them, since it is found, in the law of Moses, 'that the poor shall never cease out of the land,' and as recorded in Matthew, 25th chapter. And if it was the case that the poor were to be provided for, *who*, he would ask, *had a greater claim on their sympathies than those men who had devoted their whole time in the service of God?* The meeting were aware that their church was not now established; it was an *unendowed*, a merely *tolerated*, and a voluntary church; and as a voluntary church, they now appealed to the christian benevolence of their people, in behalf of their *poorer brethren*. But he must say, that although he belonged to a voluntary church, he was sure he spoke the sentiments of his brethren now present, when he disclaimed, in the strongest possible manner, against any community of feeling with those persons calling themselves Voluntaries, who were constantly pouring forth fierce attacks upon the establishment, and were sowing political divisions and animosities throughout this community. With *such* volunta-

¹ Episcopal Magazine, vi. *passim*.

ries the episcopal church had no community of feeling; for the episcopalians have no feelings of hostility towards the establishment. In conclusion, he was quite sure, that when their case was fully made known to the meeting, it would be speedily answered; and as the poor of the land were a part of God's family, he therefore made the present appeal, confident that it would not be in vain¹."

THE BISHOP OF ROSS AND ARGYLE moved the first resolution, and it was seconded by the earl of Morton:—That, considering the difficulties under which many congregations of the Scottish episcopal church are labouring, for want of means to procure ministerial services, as well as to provide for aged or infirm clergymen; that considering also the very inadequate provision held out for students in theology desirous of entering the ministry, it has become absolutely necessary for the friends of our church to make some exertions for procuring a permanent and efficient fund for the alleviation of these difficulties. The second resolution was moved by the bishop of Glasgow, and seconded by George Forbes, Esq. banker:—That in the opinion of this meeting, some of the evils under which the church is at present suffering, would, under the Divine blessing, be removed, or mitigated, by the operation of such a society as that contemplated by Canon XL. The very reverend Dr. Terrott, dean of Edinburgh, moved the third resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Hercules Robertson, appointing the office-bearers, with the rules and regulations to be adopted as the constitution of the society. He said, that notwithstanding many of the rural clergy were men of the greatest worth and warmest zeal for the cause of Christ, yet many of them, from actual want, were compelled to endure great privations, working for a less stipend than the wages of a menial servant. He hoped that this meeting would not for one moment allow this state of things to continue; for this society differed from other voluntary associations in this respect, that while they were merely 'associations,' the present one went much further, for it is the 'episcopal church' itself, making itself 'a church society' in every diocese; the respective bishops of each being the chairman, and the clergymen members, and forming delegates to the other societies. The present society, therefore, was not confined to one particular place, but was established on the broad principle of the 'episcopal church;' and as such, we look to our brethren in the north for their aid, and by next meeting he hoped to have it

¹ Episcopal Magazine, New Series, i. 70.

in his power to shew a reciprocity of good feeling on the part of their brethren in England, towards those who were scattered throughout the land, even to the *ultima thule*. The dean concluded by making a strong appeal in behalf of infirm clergymen, and by exhorting the rich to give of their abundance¹. - On Sunday, the 16th of December, collections were made at the different episcopal churches throughout the kingdom, in aid of the funds of this society, when an oblation of upwards of £5,000 was made. The rev. E. B. Ramsay's sermon was published, and it is now before me, in which he pleaded most powerfully the cause of the infant society. He says, "I am enabled to state the results in a few cases" of the poverty of the clergy. "In one instance (and that by no means insignificant, as to the number of the congregation), the clergyman has no certainty of *any income at all*; in another instance, the clergyman has the promise of £10 annually; in another, the same; in another, £15. One clergyman has, from *two* congregations, £30; another has, from two congregations, £20; in one instance, the clergyman gave in his congregational income at £2; in another, at £12; in another, at £6; and in another, the clergyman's *whole* income, after paying the interest of debt and a fixed portion of the principal (all of which devolved upon him), did not exceed £7. It will not be questioned that persons ministering in such congregations, and to those strongly attached to their own modes of faith and worship, have an urgent claim upon their brethren in the church for some additional means to support the decencies and necessary influence of their profession².

A MEETING was held in the Assembly Rooms, Edinburgh, on the 20th of December, to commemorate the traitorous and rebellious assembly of 1638, at Glasgow, by the ultra-protestant party of the presbyterians. Sir George Sinclair took the chair, who has two brothers clergymen of the church of England, one of whom is now archdeacon of Middlesex! The chief topic of the chairman, and the other gentlemen's speeches, was the most unmitigated slander of the clergy of the church of England, and their brethren in Scotland; and a special eulogy on the most sacrilegious and treasonable conduct of the presbyterian party in the assembly which they had met to commemorate. One of the speakers attacked the peaceable

¹ Episcopal Magazine, 2d Series, i. 70-72.

² Sermon preached in the Episcopal Chapel of St. John the Evangelist, Edinburgh, on Sunday, the 16th of December, 1838; the day appointed by the Diocesan Synod for receiving Contributions for the Scottish Episcopal Church Society, by the Rev. E. B. Ramsay, &c. p. 13.

bishop of Edinburgh in the most rancorous and venomous slang:—"Let them know," says he, "that if they arouse again the spirit of Scottish presbyterians, they will find it as firm and unflinching as ever. The [presbyterian] church of Scotland, when her zeal is once more awakened for the honour of her heavenly King, will pay but small regard to their earth-born and self-anointed dignities. She has already set her foot on the neck of the pope, and proclaimed him to the world as anti-christ; she has deposed and excommunicated bishops; and she has said, on more than one occasion, 'I will speak of thy testimonies before kings, and will not be ashamed¹.'" This shews that the spirit of presbytery is, like that of popery, ever the same; and that their crimes, both against God and the king, are unrepented of, and would be acted over again, were not the sword wielded by a firmer hand than the Glasgow Assembly had to deal with. This meeting was evidently held with the view of defying the civil power, and of coercing the government by threats of reiterating the antichristian conduct of the covenanters of 1638. In the Preface to the Report of the Meeting, this is spoken out plainly:—"The proceedings of this celebrated Assembly [of 1638], curious even as a piece of history, derive additional interest from *the position at present occupied* by the [presbyterian] church of Scotland, *in relation to the civil power*, which *strikingly coincides*, in some respects, with that in which she stood exactly this time 200 years ago." But "the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." Indeed, says the present bishop of Edinburgh, most truly, "few sights are more lamentable in the eye of a christian, or more ludicrous in that of a man of the world, than to see ministers of the gospel of peace, whether possessing or *wanting* a valid commission, assume the tone of *professed duellists*, talk with boyish bravado about 'raising a spirit,' 'treading upon necks,' 'drawing the sword,'—and making it their boast that they and their fathers and their church are not to be injured or insulted with impunity. If there be truth in Scripture, all such feelings and expressions, together with 'all hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, and envying,' are *works of the flesh*, and are not less opposed to the spirit of the gospel, than those sensual indulgences which are most commonly so designated²."

1839.—PROPOSALS WERE made this year for building a new church at Ballyhulish, in the diocese of Ross; "the congre-

¹ Report of the Public Meeting, &c. 33.

² Reasons for avoiding Controversy, p. 14.

gation of which," the bishop of that diocese writes, "is one of the most interesting in the whole church, consisting of 1000 poor but worthy highlanders, of whom I confirmed eighty-five the summer before last¹." To this building, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge contributed £100; and Charles Stuart, esq., of Ballyhulish, gave the ground on which the church was built, with forty feet of ground surrounding it. He also erected a neat parsonage for the residence of the clergyman, and gave, in perpetuity, two acres of land as a glebe to the incumbent. The archbishop of Canterbury contributed £20 towards the erection of a church in Stornoway, which is the principal town of the island of Lewis, in the county and diocese of Ross; and his grace also gave £10 to the church which was then building in Forres, in the county and diocese of Moray. The ancient bishoprick of Moray being now under the superintendence of bishop Low, he made a donation of £15 to the church of Forres, at the same time giving his official sanction to the undertaking².

THE FUNDAMENTAL charter of presbytery—"the inclinations of the people,"—was beginning to slip from under the fabric which it was alleged to have at first supported; and retributive justice was beginning to overtake the kirk, for her many sins against the church of Christ. The politico-religious sect, gathered out of all the sects, rejoicing under the name of voluntaries, gave the first decided indication of the change of popular opinion. At Dundee, a public meeting was held one evening, in a seceder meeting-house, for some religious purpose connected with the support of the establishment. The *people* tumultuously burst in, broke the windows, extinguished the lights, and dispersed the meeting. At a "church extension" meeting, held in the parish church of West Calder, about twelve miles west from Edinburgh, of which archbishop Spottiswood was once the incumbent, the vulgar "voluntaries took forcible possession of the body of the sacred edifice, and frustrated the purpose of the assembly by the most brutish uproar. Cries of 'No churches' resounded from all sides, and defeated every attempt of the ministers present to be heard." At a church and school extension meeting at Dumfermline, the presbytery were threatened with interruption by the mob, when the moderator sent a written requisition to the sheriff-substitute, and also to the provost, for protection. The latter functionary evidently wished the rioters success, for he went to the country and refused to appear; the mob assaulted the

¹ Private Letter.

² Episcopal Magazine, 2d Series, i. 135.

kirk door with paving-stones and wooden rammers, and soon forced an entrance. In the meantime the presbytery drew up a protest, and, after reading it, retired by the vestry door, without receiving any protection from the sheriff, who was present. The kirk, "like a hard-hunted beast," was now more beset by that very people who had "drank deep of the poisonous stream of voluntaryism," but on whose inclinations she rested her claim to an establishment. In this time of retributive justice, it is consolatory to think that not one solitary episcopalian was engaged in the voluntary crusade against the kirk; on the contrary, they returned good for evil, and did what was in their power, consistently with their principles, to assist and support it in its distress. Its danger has risen solely from men nurtured in its own bosom; and who are only following out the precept and example of Henderson and others, in the reign of Charles I., and turning them against their teachers. The established ministers might, if they were not judicially blind, see the difference of conduct in the episcopalians and the voluntaries, and be convinced that there must be something in *the system* of each which produces such different results. A "voluntary" system, which teaches men to *hate and persecute* their neighbour, cannot be of God; whereas the church that prays that all ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt of God's word, may be taken away from all heretics and schismatics, and that they may be brought home to Christ's flock and be saved, among the remnant of the true Israllites, must be the right one¹.

BISHOP WALKER informed the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, that bishop Russell, as his substitute, had laid the foundation-stone of a new church at Alloa, for which the society had remitted £100, of which he thankfully acknowledged the receipt. The rev. Charles Pressly and his vestrymen solicited assistance from the Society for the rebuilding of St. Peter's Church, Frasersburgh, and it was accompanied by the following letter from Dr. Skinner, bishop of the diocese:—"I cannot refuse my cordial sanction to their application, or decline earnestly to solicit for it the generous attention of your board. And I feel somewhat more encouraged in making this appeal, from my being enabled to inform the society that the congregation that now solicits their benevolent assistance formed the pastoral charge, for nearly the last half century, of the justly venerated and much lamented bishop Jolly, whose meek and humble piety, and no less pro-

¹ Episcopal Magazine, i. 305-315.

found learning, gained for his name a richly-merited reputation, far beyond the limits of that portion of Christ's catholic and apostolic church of which, through a lengthened term of years, he proved so distinguished an ornament. But besides the necessity which is felt, and in their petition affirmed to exist, for improved and extended accommodation, the episcopal congregation in Frasersburgh are most anxious to obtain the erection of a suitable edifice, as a lasting memorial of one who, by his piety and virtues, was not only endeared to them and their families, but who was universally acknowledged by persons of every religious denomination to have eminently adorned the clerical and the christian character. And they are of opinion, that no monument could be devised for that purpose more strictly congenial with all the feelings and inclinations of their late revered bishop and pastor. I am confident, that an intention so truly pious, affectionate, and every way becoming a congregation of christian worshippers, will be generously responded to by the members of your board¹. The sum of £50 was liberally granted by the board in aid of this object¹.

MR. NICHOLLS, member for Cardiff, gave notice in the House of Commons for the following session, for a bill to amend the statute 32 Geo. III. c. 68, "to enable bishops and priests canonically ordained of the protestant episcopal church in Scotland, with the written permission of the ordinary and consent of the incumbent, to perform divine services and offices, to preach and administer the sacraments in churches and chapels in England or Ireland, belonging to the established church." The triennial general meeting of the Friendly Society was held in St. Andrew's church, Aberdeen, on the 10th of August, when it appeared that the funds of the society were in a highly flourishing state, and every thing connected with the affairs of the society were in such a state as to give full satisfaction to the members present. At a meeting of the Church Society, Mr. Ramsay, the secretary, mentioned the great encouragement that the society had met with from the prelates, clergy, and members of the church of England. The archbishop of Canterbury had given his name as an annual subscriber for £20; the bishop of London for £10; and several of the other bishops for smaller sums. Several families in the neighbourhood of Wick, in the county and diocese of Caithness, made proposals to bishop Low for the erection of a church in that town, but it does not appear to

¹ Episcopal Magazine, i. 396.

have been carried out. A subscription was begun by Mr. Collins, a bank-agent in Aberdeen, for the erection of an episcopal church in Upper Banchory, in the county of Kincardine and diocese of Aberdeen, and eighty pounds were subscribed. A bursary of £20 was instituted at Marischal College, University of Aberdeen, to be given to the son of any episcopal clergyman who may intend to study for the church; and if there be no clergyman's son studying, to any other youth preparing for holy orders, to be gained by competition, when there are more than one candidate. This bursary is to be awarded by the bishop of Aberdeen for the time being. The bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, held a diocesan synod at Kirkcaldy, in the former diocese, in order to settle a dispute betwixt the rev. John Marshall, the incumbent, and the managers of St. Peter's church, in that town; after hearing the evidence on both sides, it was the opinion of the synod that Mr. Marshall's connection with that congregation should be dissolved, and bishop Torry pronounced the sentence accordingly.

A GENERAL MEETING of the Church Society was held in the Hopetoun rooms, Edinburgh, on the 4th of September; the bishop of Aberdeen in the chair. There were present also the bishops of Ross and Argyle, Glasgow, and the coadjutor of Brechin. From the diocesan returns, the subscriptions, donations, and congregational collections, amounted to about £3555, to which was added the sum of £710 from the treasurer of the Gaelic society, which was now merged into the Church society. A sub-committee was appointed, which met the following day in the Episcopal Library, when grants for the augmentation of the income of the clergy were made, amounting to nearly £700, and about £500 were appropriated to the other purposes of the society¹.

THE FIRST ANNUAL meeting of the Church Society was held on the 11th of December, in the Hopetoun rooms, the right rev. the bishop of Ross, &c. in the chair. Prayers having been read, the rev. E. B. Ramsay, the secretary, read the report, a document of considerable length, and of great importance. It says, among other things, the committee "would rejoice in the society attaining such success as might enable them to rescue the church from the depressing effects of that poverty which now exists in some portions of it—a poverty which no one can have witnessed without perceiving the many evils which it produces, and the many impediments which it

¹ Episcopal Magazine, i. 523-587-651.

often throws in the way of ministerial usefulness. By the statistical returns it will be seen, that of thirty-two incumbencies described, not one has reached £80 yearly; that many are under £40, and that in several the incomes derived from the congregations are merely nominal. . . . It has been the chief object of the committee to assist those among the clergy who have been lowest in the scale of income. They have appropriated about £700 to that purpose, distributed among thirty-two incumbents, to bring up their incomes to £80 each, and have aided congregations in procuring assistants to the extent of £125."

AFTER READING the report, the following resolutions were moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to:—1st. That the report now read be approved, and ordered to be printed for distribution among the members of the society, and for general circulation. 2d. That from the returns made to the society, wants have been found to exist in the church which call both for sympathy and assistance, and which demand a cheerful and ready co-operation from all the members of the church—a co-operation calculated, at the same time, to promote a spirit of union and of harmony among themselves, as christians and as churchmen. 3d. That whilst they gratefully acknowledge the success which, under the blessing of God, has attended the efforts of the society since its constitution, on December the 4th, 1838, this meeting would express their strong conviction of the necessity for increased and steady exertion in promoting the different objects of the society. 4th. That the thanks of the meeting be given to the right rev. bishop Low, for the urbanity and kindness with which he had presided over the meeting.

THE BISHOP OF Ross, &c. then said,—“ I have only to bear my humble testimony, that in my diocese this society has been the means of *gladdening many sequestered glens, and the lonely islands of the Scottish sea.*” The rev. Robert Montgomery, in rising to move the second resolution, said,—“ I can never forget that it is a mournful thing that now, in the nineteenth century of christianity, such *destitution* should exist in the episcopal church. What is the fact?—that men who are under the guidance of God’s Spirit, duly authorised for their work, and daily pursuing their round of usefulness, should *not receive* so much as the reward given to those who perform the *drudgery of commercial life*! Whatever may be the history of other churches, the history of the Scottish episcopalian church contains many pages which might be written *with tears*, and which *cannot be read without sighs.*”

Whilst the spirit of chivalry has thrown its halo round the struggles of the covenanters, *the sufferings* of the episcopalians have been *unlaurelled by the wreath of history, and unchanted by the muse of poetry*. Where is the man, with a heart in his bosom, who can read the fragments of their history from 1748 to 1792, without a thrill of pity, and a glow of admiration for the heroism of the men who hailed their colours to the mast of *principle*, and determined never to take them down, whether they waved in the sunshine and the calm of prosperity, or were rent in the gloom and storms of adversity. Let the example of these heroes of our church plead eloquently to-day. I grant that we are now in a milder atmosphere. Prejudice and bigotry have shrunk away, detected in the midst of the light of truth ; yet we can never forget that we are only a *tolerated*, not a triumphant—a *protesting*, not a prosperous church ; and that *poverty* is still our badge. I come from Glasgow ; and in that city I can point out to you fields which have been opened, under the good providence of God, where your energy and philanthropy may have room to expatiate for years to come. There were about 10,000 episcopalians in Glasgow, besides considerable numbers in the adjoining towns, most of whom have come from England and Ireland, and are in a state of poverty, destitution, and spiritual midnight, to an extent which I never saw realized before. I bless God, that while the wants of the church have been discovered, the society has *not let down* a single principle to meet those wants. It has avoided that plague-spot of all the economies of our day — *expediency*. What is expediency ? *It is the creed of darkness—the delusion of the devil*. It has shaded the throne ; it has degraded the court ; it has mangled the bible ; it has broken down the walls of eternal justice, and forged the broad seal of heaven to stamp its authority on *a lie*—that the end sanctifies *the means*.” The dean of Edinburgh, in seconding the second resolution, expressed his earnest hope that the society would be enabled to fix the minimum income of the church at £150 a year, which is the lowest income of the established ministers. Mr. Urquhart, in moving the third resolution, adverted to the “Episcopal Fund,” originally commenced by sir William Forbes, and some other zealous friends of the church ; the principal object of which was to make provision for the bishops ; and all that this fund could raise for them was sixty guineas per annum ! “ He could well understand, however, how this important object had been left out of the views of this society. It was formed out of the sanction of a canon of

the church ;—that canon must have been framed [or at least revised] by the right reverend fathers, the bishops ; and they, with their accustomed disinterestedness, had overlooked their own claims and their own rights, in their anxiety to administer to the relief of the suffering clergy. He had only to mention, that the two societies did not injure each other ; on the contrary, the more this [the church] society flourished, the more would the episcopal fund be able to fulfil its principal object ; for this society would then take the relief of the clergy into its own hands, and leave the trustees of the fund free to give a more becoming allowance to the College of Bishops¹.”

IN AID OF THIS FUND, sermons were preached in the different dioceses throughout the kingdom ; and a pastoral letter that had been authorised by the episcopal synod in September, was read in each congregation. This pastoral letter was written by the primus ; and it states, that “ on Thursday, the 5th of September, a statistical report of the church, for the year 1838, was laid before the synod, of which the following is a short abstract :—83 congregations ; 86 clergymen ; 2113 baptisms ; 2098 catechumens ; 784 confirmed ; 204 marriages ; 404 deaths ; 8523 Communicants².” This report was made from hastily drawn up returns, and is, of course, not complete. The congregational offerings were—Edinburgh, £461 7s. 11d. ; Glasgow, £121 17s. 5d. ; Aberdeen, £136 17s. 3d. ; Ross and Argyle, £120 1s. ; Dunkeld, £92 9s. 9d. ; Brechin, £184 15s. 9d. In all, £1117 9s. 1d.³

THE PRESBYTERY of Auchterarder, as already mentioned, appealed to the House of Lords against the judgment of the court of Session ; but, after hearing counsel on both sides, that house affirmed the sentence of the court below, as follows :—“ It is ordered and adjudged, by the lords spiritual and temporal, in parliament assembled, that the said petition and appeal be, and is hereby, dismissed this house ; and that the said interlocutor therein complained of be, and the same is hereby, AFFIRMED.” The court of session accordingly pronounced an interlocutor on the 8th of June, declaring that the presbytery of Auchterarder “ are still bound and astricted to make trial of the qualifications of Mr. Robert Young, as presentee to the church and parish of Auchterarder, and . . . if he is found qualified, to receive and admit him minister of the said church.” A majority, however, of the presbytery,

¹ Edinburgh Courant ; cited in Episcopal Magazine, ii. 12-19.

² Pastoral Letter addressed to the Clergy and Laity of the Episcopal Communion of Scotland, by the Bishops of that Church, p. v.

³ Report of the Scottish Episcopal Church Society, for the year 1839, 54-56.

decided on referring the matter to the commission of assembly, when Mr. Young's law-agent presented a notarial protest, intimating that he would hold the presbytery liable for all the consequences of their disobedience to the law. Mr. Young then commenced an action at law against the majority of the presbytery¹.

THE PARISH OF LETHENDY, in the county of Perth and diocese of Dunkeld, was the next point of collision between the ecclesiastical and civil powers. Mr. Clark was appointed by the crown, assistant, or curate and successor to the aged minister of that parish. The presbytery of Dunkeld took the usual steps for Mr. Clark's ordination, but they refused to proceed, as he was *vetoed* by the parishioners. The Assembly of 1836 approved of the procedure of the presbytery, and in February, 1837, the minister died, when Mr. Clark brought an action against the presbytery in November of that year. When the Kirk became vacant, the crown presented a Mr. Kessen; the people agreed to accept him, and the presbytery were ready to ordain and induct him. Mr. Clark sued out, and received an interdict from the court of session to prohibit the presbytery of Dunkeld to ordain Mr. Kessen. The presbytery referred the matter to the Assembly of 1838, which, in turn, referred it to the commission, which court ordained the presbytery to proceed without delay to the induction of Mr. Kessen. Mr. Clark now applied for, and received, another interdict, to prohibit the presbytery of Dunkeld from settling Mr. Kessen. This brought the matter again before the commission, which renewed their directions to the presbytery to disregard the interdict as illegal, and commanded them to ordain Mr. Kessen on a certain day. Mr. Kessen was accordingly ordained on the 18th of September, *on the call of the people*, but leaving the fruits of the benefice to be settled by the court of session. Mr. Clark petitioned the court of session to punish the members of the presbytery. The court declared the presbytery guilty of the breach of an interdict, and summoned the members of the presbytery to their bar. When the presbytery of Dunkeld appeared in a body at the bar of the court of session, several of those ministers who afterwards became seceders took their places beside them at the bar. The lord president Hope, himself a presbyterian, pronounced the solemn censure of the court,—“That it was with considerable difficulty that so lenient a measure had been adopted; but should any simi-

¹ Dublin Review, No. xxvii.—Hetherington's History, 242.

lar case again occur, the punishment of imprisonment would be inflicted¹."

BUT THE PLOT THICKENED; the kirk militant was not to be killed quietly. In June, 1837, the earl of Fife presented Mr. John Edwards to the vacant kirk and parish of Marnock, in the presbytery of Strathbogie, in the county of Banff, and diocese of Moray. In the following November, the parishioners vetoed him; but as the veto had been declared illegal, and the judgment of the House of Lords was not yet known, the presbytery asked the advice of the synod of Moray. That synod instructed them to give effect to the veto; but from this instruction the presbytery appealed to the General Assembly of 1838. The parishioners appealed to that court against the presbytery, for disobeying the synod. The Assembly repelled the presbytery's appeal, and directed them to reject Mr. Edwards. In consequence of this decision, the earl of Fife presented a Mr. Henry; but Mr. Edwards applied to the court of session, and received an interdict to prevent the presbytery from ordaining or inducting Mr. Henry. He also raised an action of "Declarator" against the presbytery, heritors of the parish, and the collector of the Widows' Fund, to have it found that his presentation was valid, that his rejection under the veto act was illegal, and that the presbytery were bound to take him on his trials. In July, 1838, a majority of seven out of eleven of the presbytery of Strathbogie, resolved "that the court of session having authority in matters relating to the induction of ministers, and having interdicted all proceedings on the part of the presbytery in this case, and it being the duty of the presbytery to submit to their authority regularly interposed, the presbytery *do delay* all procedure until the matters in dispute be legally determined." The minority complained of this resolution to the synod of Moray, who referred their complaint to the Assembly of this year; by whom it was again referred to their commission, giving them ample powers to determine the case. Although the decision of the House of Lords was known before the meeting of Assembly, yet the commission directed the presbytery of Strathbogie to *suspend* proceedings; and as the presbytery had resolved that the court of session had authority in the induction of ministers, the commission prohibited them from proceeding to the induction of Mr. Edwards till the next meeting of the Assembly, in 1840. The court of session granted to

¹ Edinburgh Advertiser.—Hetherington's History.

Mr. Edwards the "Declarator" for which he had sued on the 3th of June, finding that "the presbytery of Strathbogie are all bound and astricted to make trial of the qualifications of the pursuer, Mr. Edwards, and, if found qualified, to receive and admit him as minister of the parish of Marnock." This judgment was notarially intimated to the presbytery, and the majority resolved to obey, and requested a special meeting to be called, for carrying the decree of the court into effect; and their resolution was communicated to the commission "in a courteous, firm, and deferential report." The commission met at Edinburgh on the 11th of December, and the celebrity of this case occasioned a fuller meeting than had ever before assembled. Both parties were heard by their counsel; but the commission reversed the whole of the presbytery's proceedings, and suspended the seven ministers that composed the majority from the office of the ministry, till the next meeting of the Assembly, and prohibited Mr. Edwards from making any further application till the Assembly met. The suspended ministers immediately craved the protection of the court of session, and prayed the court to suspend the proceedings of the commission—to interdict and prohibit the minority of the presbytery, and all others, from interfering with and molesting them, either by giving effect to the orders of the commission or by holding any presbyterial meetings; and also to interdict and prohibit the persons appointed by the commission from preaching or intimating the sentence of deposition in their kirks or parishes. The clerical agents of the commission were obliged to submit to the letter of the interdict, but they broke it in the spirit; for the sentence was proclaimed in the open air, in such convenient places as they could draw a crowd round them; and at such places, the ministers sent by the commission preached to the people, and inflamed their minds against their own ministers¹.

1840.—THE PRIZE GIVEN this year, at the Bell Lecture, for an Essay on the History and Advantages of the Parochial System of Education in Scotland, was gained by Mr. Thomas Russell, a licentiate or probationer of the establishment; and it was presented to him by the right reverend Dr. Russell, bishop of Glasgow. Her majesty, queen Victoria, married his royal highness prince Albert of Saxe Coburg Gotha, on the 10th of February; and the bishops and clergy of the reformed catholic church of Scotland sent the following loyal

¹ Edinburgh Advertiser; cited in Episcopal Magazine, New Series, ii.—Dublin Review, No. xxvii. pp. 84-93.—Hetherington's History, 244, 246.

and dutiful address to the marquis of Normanby, by whom it was presented to her majesty, and who received it most graciously :—

“ MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,—We, your majesty’s dutiful and loyal subjects, the bishops and clergy of the Scottish episcopal church, animated with the warmest attachment to your majesty’s sacred person and government, beg leave most respectfully to approach the throne, to tender our hearty congratulations on the matrimonial alliance which your majesty has recently formed with an amiable prince of a house eminently illustrious in the history of Europe. In all ranks of society much interest is attached to that solemn institution which was established by the great Creator in the beginning of time, and honoured by the blessed Redeemer at once by His presence and by His first miracle ; but more especially is marriage important in that high station in which, by the Divine Providence, your majesty is placed, because it is thereby connected with the dearest hopes of a powerful and enlightened nation. It is therefore with sentiments of the most lively satisfaction that we contemplate your majesty’s union with his royal highness prince Albert of Saxe Coburg and Gotha, piously hoping, and fervently praying, that, through God’s good providence, it may prove the means of perpetuating to future generations those sacred and social institutions which, by the Divine blessing on the mild sway and constitutional government of your majesty’s illustrious predecessors, have long secured to the people of this great nation the invaluable blessings of domestic peace and civil and religious liberty. We embrace this opportunity of assuring your majesty that it is our constant endeavour to impress upon those under our pastoral care a deep feeling of respect for the constitutional principles of the monarchy, a due reverence for the law of the land, and a cordial affection for their most gracious sovereign. In conclusion, we heartily pray that it may please Almighty God to bless your majesty with health and long life ; that, among the other gifts of the Divine Providence, it may be your majesty’s happiness to see numerous descendants spring up around the throne, well prepared for the various duties which belong to the royal estate.—Signed by us, the bishops, in our own names, and in the name and on behalf of the clergy of our communion, at Edinburgh, 12th of February, 1840¹.”

¹ Episcopal Magazine, ii. 112-218.

THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. GLEIG, bishop of Brechin, and late primus of the reformed catholic church of Scotland, died at his own house in Stirling, on the 9th of March, in the eighty-seventh year of his age, and the thirty-second of his episcopate. The right reverend Dr. Moir, his coadjutor, succeeded to the full administration of the diocese of Brechin, agreeably to the arrangement entered into at his consecration¹. Mr. Lawson has very justly said, "Dr. Gleig was one of the most eminent men of his day, and as a scholar, theologian, a metaphysician, and a critic, his name stood for more than sixty years among the most distinguished of his contemporaries in England and Scotland². The earl of Elgin gave the sum of £100 towards the erection of an episcopal church in Dumfermline, which has since been erected, in consequence of the minds of many of the people having been disgusted at the proceedings of the non-intrusionists. A most atrocious attempt having been made by a vain-glorious youth to shoot her majesty and her royal consort on the 10th of June, prayers and thanksgivings were offered up in all the episcopal churches in Scotland, according to the form issued by the archbishop of Canterbury, after which a prayer for unity was also offered up.

IT WILL BE REMEMBERED that the act which repealed the penal laws against the Scottish church in 1792, imposed a restriction on the clergy of Scottish ordination from officiating or holding livings in England. To remove these restrictions, and to draw closer the bonds of union and communion betwixt the two churches, the archbishop of Canterbury introduced a bill in the end of May into the House of Lords, "to make certain provisions and regulations in respect of the exercise, within England and Ireland, of their office by the bishops and clergy canonically ordained of the protestant episcopal church in Scotland; and also to extend such provisions and regulations to the bishops and clergy of the protestant episcopal church in the United States of America." The following is the preamble to the act, but which still leaves a restriction that makes the matter not much better than it was before :—"WHEREAS an act was passed in the 32d year of the reign of his late majesty king Geo. III. entitled an 'Act for granting relief to persons of the episcopal communion in Scotland;' and whereas it is expedient to alter and amend the said act, and to enable the bishops of the protestant episcopal church in Scotland, and the priests of such church canonically ordained, under

¹ Episcopal Magazine, ii. 224.

² History of Scottish Episcopal Church, p. 418.

certain limitations and restrictions, to perform divine service, to preach, and to administer the sacraments according to the rites and ceremonies of the united church of England and Ireland in churches and chapels within England or Ireland where the liturgy of the said united church is used; be it enacted, &c. . . . That it shall be lawful for the bishop of any diocese in England or Ireland, if he shall think fit, on the application of any bishop of the protestant episcopal church in Scotland, or of any priest of such church canonically ordained by any bishop thereof residing and exercising, at the time of such ordination, episcopal functions within some district or place in Scotland, to grant permission under his hand, and from time to time also under his hand to renew such permission, to any such bishop or priest to perform divine service, to preach, and administer the sacraments, according to the rites and ceremonies of the united church of England and Ireland, for any one day, or any two days, and no more, in any church or chapel within the diocese of the said bishop where the liturgy of the said united church is used, such day or days, and church or chapel, to be specified in such permission; and thereupon it shall be lawful for the party mentioned in such permission, or renewed permission, with the consent of the incumbent or officiating minister of such church or chapel, to perform divine service, and to preach and administer the sacraments therein, according to the rites and ceremonies of the united church of England and Ireland, on the day or days specified in such written permission, or renewed permission, and no other¹."

ON THE PETITION of the Rev. Alexander Bruce and others, supported by a strong recommendation from the bishop of Aberdeen, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge granted the sum of £50 towards paying off the debt incurred in the erection of the episcopal church in Banff. The annual synods of the church were held in the summer; and in that of Aberdeen bishop Skinner alluded to the happy and quiet condition of the episcopal church, and particularly to the act recently passed in parliament, which received the royal assent on the 23d of July, by which the unity of principle betwixt this church and the united church of England and Ireland is still more completely manifested. A report of the Aberdeen diocesan association of the Scottish Episcopal Church Society for this year shews that the subscription in that diocese for the year 1839, when it was formed, and the present, amounted

¹ Act cited in Epis. Mag. ii. 507.

to £929 13s., and for 1839 the sum distributed was £287 5s. 2d.; viz. £156 15s. 10d. to nine clergymen to raise their incomes to £80—£30 toward obtaining an assistant for an aged and infirm clergyman, £50 towards rebuilding one chapel, and £50 towards liquidating the debt on another, besides £21 18s. 9d. retained for diocesan purposes¹. About this time, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone made proposals to the bishops for the erection of an episcopal college, and that a course of study, similar to that pursued in the English universities, should be adopted. At a synod of the bishops the proposal was taken into their consideration; but they were startled at the extent of the scheme, and its apparent impracticability, and gave but a slow consent to its commencement. Several new congregations were formed this year that met in temporary apartments in Jedburgh and Airdrie, in the formerly covenanted diocese of Glasgow; at Falkirk, in the diocese of Edinburgh, through the influence of Mr. Forbes, of Callander, and another in Dumfermline, in the diocese of St. Andrews, consisting chiefly of new adherents to the church; and the Rev. Jonathan Douphrate was inducted to the pastoral charge of a small church at Fochabers, in the diocese of Moray. On the 24th of September, the bishop of Glasgow, acting for the primus, consecrated the burial ground belonging to St. John the Evangelist's church in Edinburgh, assisted by the Rev. E. B. Ramsay, the incumbent, and all the episcopal clergy of Edinburgh². A meeting of the "constituent members" of St. Paul's independent chapel in Aberdeen was held, when the proposal was made of an union with the reformed catholic church. It was warmly supported by the most influential members; some unimportant objections were started, but they were overruled, and a committee was appointed to confer with the bishop of the diocese "on the terms of union³." Alas! they knew not of what spirit they were; for the only "terms" ought to have been deep repentance for their long-continued and most obstinate schism, and their humble *petition* to have been received as "constituent members" of Christ's holy catholic and apostolic church, which they were not.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL meeting of the Church Society was held in the Hopetoun Rooms on the 1st of December: the bishop of Ross and Argyle took the chair, supported by the bishop of Glasgow, all the clergy of Edinburgh and the neighbour-

¹ Report, &c. p. 7.² Episcopal Magazine, ii. 564-620.³ Aberdeen Constitutional.

the dissensions in the kirk, under their consideration, and rejected it by a majority of eighty-seven. In August, an indictment was prepared against the seven ministers, and carried by a majority of one hundred and twenty-five. They also indicted Mr. Edwards for violation of their injunctions in continuing to prosecute the maintenance of his legal rights. The seven ministers had taken Mr. Edwards on his trials in February, and found him qualified; but they hesitated to ordain and induct him. On this he entered an action of damages against both the presbyteries of Strathbogie, that is, the suspended and the unsuspended sections of it, to compel them to admit him to the parish of Marnock, and laid his damages at £11,000. The case was heard; the seven ministers expressed their willingness to proceed, but the four which composed the minority of the presbytery disputed the jurisdiction of the Court of Session. On the 18th of December the Court of Session decreed that Mr. Edwards should be ordained and inducted to his parish by the suspended seven¹.

1841.—IT WAS STATED BY Mr. Gladstone, in his admirable speech at the meeting of the Church Society, that a petition had been signed by 120 heads of families resident in Dalkeith and the neighbourhood to have the blessing of a church erected in that town; “they are not moved,” he said, “through the influence or solicitations of the great, the wealthy, or the noble, but by a warm attachment to the episcopal communion.” It was favourably received by the heads of the church, and the same parties petitioned the duke of Buccleugh, saying—“being *bond fide* members of the reformed catholic church . . . we can enjoy no opportunity of worshipping God according to that form and ritual to which we are sincerely and conscientiously attached . . . we therefore most respectfully appeal to you, soliciting your sanction, concurrence, and assistance, in the building of an episcopal chapel in the town or vicinity of Dalkeith.” His grace listened to the prayer of their petition, and he not only built but has also endowed a church in that town. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge most liberally presented £100 to the funds for erecting a church in Dumfermline, for the episcopal congregation there. A curious circumstance occurred in Glasgow, which marks either a step in advance in the right direction, or else a lukewarmness on which the “Fathers of the Secession” would have imprecated the vengeance of heaven. The minister and elders of one of

¹ Hetherington's History, 247, 248.—Dublin Review, 92, 93.—Edinburgh Advertiser—Aberdeen Constitutional.—Episcopal Mag. New Series, 11.

ese seceding congregations *offered* the use of their meeting-house to the Rev. R. Montgomery, of St. Jude's, on the occasion of a charity sermon! The Rev. W. M. Wade, of Trinity Church, Paisley, *read the morning* service of the Church of England to the entire satisfaction of the seceders, and Mr. Montgomery afterwards preached with his usual popular eloquence, in this seceding meeting-house¹! The independent chapel of St. Paul's in Aberdeen was united to the church on the 14th of January, on nearly their own terms: the admission not having been marked by any appearance of either repentance or shame for their long-continued and most unjustifiable schism. This hollow union had then left only the two dissimulated independent meetings of Montrose and Perth to continue their unnatural, causeless, and most sinful revolt².

AFTER MANY YEARS of suffering from chronic rheumatism, and consequent confinement to his house, the right rev. James Walker, D.D. bishop of Edinburgh, *Primus*, and the Pantheistic professor of divinity, died at his residence, 22, Stafford Street, on the 5th of March, and in the seventy-first year of his age. His remains were interred on the south-side of the burying-ground of St. John the Evangelist, which his intimate and confidential friend, the bishop of Glasgow, had so recently consecrated. Although a plain tombstone only marks the spot where his mortal remains rest in the hope of a blessed resurrection, yet an elegant marble monument has been erected by subscription on the north wall inside the church, equal to that of his predecessor, bishop Sandford³. Bishop Walker died at Marischal College, Aberdeen, and afterwards entered St. John's College, Cambridge, where he resided the usual number of terms, and took the several degrees in arts. On Monday, the 25th of June, 1826, he preached at Great St. Mary's Church, Cambridge, "on the original, successive, and permanent evidence of revealed religion," when he took his degree of doctor in divinity. That sermon, with others, was published at the request of his late congregation, in 1829, in which he himself says in the preface, "The gratuitous nature of christian redemption, the inability of man in himself, and the indispensable necessity of God's grace in Christ to make him what the gospel requires him to be, in order to inherit eternal life, I have ever taught, or intended to teach, to the extent of my ability." The only cure he ever held, as I heard him say in his farewell sermon, was the the small chapel of

Glasgow paper.—Church of England Mag. x. Part lvi.

Aberdeen Constitutional.

³ Lawson's Scottish Episcopal Church, 421.

St Peters in Edinburgh, which declining health induced him to resign. To the duties of the episcopal office and of the primacy were added those of Pantonian professor of divinity, and it is hoped that those whom he trained up in the sound theology of the catholic church will endeavour to copy the example of his integrity, zeal, and ardent love of the church. In the scenes of domestic life “bishop Walker taught by example as well as by precept; and those who knew him best will ever have the highest opinion of his character, and particularly of that rare consistency between profession and practice, which shewed that the former had its *seat in the heart*. He was beloved by his friends, highly respected by the clergy under his inspection, and venerated by the whole body of the church over which he presided¹.”

THE READER WHO HAS accompanied me through the long period that has elapsed since the destruction of the church in Scotland that yielded obedience to the see of Rome, will have seen cause to admire the goodness and mercy of God, and also His faithfulness in preventing “the gates,” that is, the agents “of hell”—the followers both of Loyola and of the Solemn League and Covenant—from utterly extirpating His church. Many now alive, and others by tradition, may be enabled to assent to bishop Walker’s words:—“It was his privilege,” he said to a friend, about two years before his death, “to see the episcopal church in Scotland placed under circumstances which, in the earlier days of his ministry, he never could possibly have expected, and he heartily desired to thank God for it.” Under God, for much of her prosperity the church is indebted to the vast exertions and the great self-denial of bishop John Skinner, who procured the repeal of the persecuting statutes which had nearly accomplished her extinction; and who healed the independent schism that commenced in the eighteenth century, and for which his memory will be held in everlasting remembrance. Under the primacy of bishop Walker, the canons of the church have been revised, and a system of government permanently fixed in annual episcopal synods, where appeals from either clergy or laity against the sentence of their own immediate bishop are heard and determined, and general synods of both orders are to be assembled in two chambers, when important business requires such a convocation².

BUT A REFORMATION yet remains to be accomplished which is most devoutly to be wished for; but so long as the clergy

¹ Edinburgh Courant, cited by Mr. Lawson, p. 421.

² Canons, xxxii.-xxxiv.

re afflicted with a modesty which, in this case, must be useful, because it is a withholding part of the whole counsel of God, it will never be accomplished. This reformation is to be effected in the laity by a more generous support of God's worship. The spirit of sacrilege and covetousness has been so long and so universally prevalent, that whatsoever is given to God is given with reluctance and a grudge—with an evident desire to hold that little back, when an opportunity offers. God has demanded a seventh of our *time*, and a tenth of our *property*, for His active honour and worship, with our substance; and He has very often commanded that none shall appear *empty* before Him, but to bring an *offering* when we come into His courts. Now the clergy have utterly neglected to teach this necessary doctrine, partly, perhaps, from a false modesty, because God has appointed them to be the receivers and usufructuaries of the oblations of the people, and partly from the fear of offending the laity, who are more desirous that they should prophesy smooth things to them, than that they should fearlessly lay the whole truth before them. Bishop Horne is said to have paid the church in Scotland the compliment of reckoning it as pure as the primitive church; but do the people in the one imitate the liberality of the other? Mr. Selden, who was no great friend to the church, says, “so liberal, in the beginning of christianity, was the devotion of believers, that their bounty to the evangelical priesthood *far exceeded* what the tenth could have been.”—“The liberality formerly used had been such, that, in respect thereof, tenths were a *small part*.” And “it had been little to the purpose, indeed, to have had tithes of annual increase paid, while that *most fruitful devotion* of good christians continued in frequent offerings, both of lands and goods, to such large value.” This liberality continued till the end of the fourth century; when, alas! the love of many “waxed cold.” Now, in this very same year, there was a necessity to augment the incomes of thirty-two clergymen to eighty pounds, by the church society, from *nine pounds* per annum the lowest, to seventy-five pounds the highest!¹ In this particular, at all events, the Scottish and the primitive church *will not bear a comparison*. Before the conversion of Constantine, the priests of the false gods of the Gentiles were in possession of the tithes, which descended to them by tradition after the dispersion of Israel, and which they derived from the patriarchal church. The presbyterian establishment likewise are in possession of the

¹ Report for 1839, p. 35.

tithes which had been bestowed on the church by the piety of our remote ancestors. But here the comparison betwixt the present church in Scotland, and the primitive church, fails; inasmuch as the latter voluntarily gave munificently to the clergy and the poor, whereas the former allowed many of their clergy actually to starve, till the National Church Fund compassionately placed them above want. The Church Society is a good beginning; may it increase and prosper, to gladden the heart of many a poor priest, who, having sown to us spiritual things, have a just and a *divine* right to reap of our worldly things! "They who minister about holy things live of the sacrifice," and there are offerings and sacrifices under the gospel, as well as there were bloody sacrifices under the law—the one typical, the other commemorative, yet both pointing to the only true and propitiatory sacrifice on the cross. "They who wait at the altar are partakers with the altar" of the offerings there made and solemnly dedicated to God by the prayer for the church militant. The apostle has assured us, that, as the Jewish priests were partakers of the people's offerings at the altar in the Temple, "EVEN so hath the Lord ordained, that they who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel;" that is, of the oblations and the tithes of the people. St. John saw "three unclean spirits, like frogs, come out of the mouth of the Dragon, and out of the mouth of the Beast, and out of the mouth of the False Prophet." Of these, Mr. Faber says, "In matter of fact, we certainly see, at the very time when such a development might be expected, *Three Principles* in joint operation for a common object of evil. The principles of *Infidelity*, strongly exhibited and embodied in the form of irreligious and *practically* unbelieving *Political Expediency*, may justly be said to spring from the Dragon, or Satan. The principle of *Democratic Anarchy*, now fermenting in the western empire, and deeply impregnated both with sensuality and infidelity, may similarly be said to spring out of the Wild Beast, or the corrupt mass of that temporal empire now lying politically dead as a whole, by the excision of its short-lived seventh or imperial Francic head [Buonaparte]; and the principle of active *Popish Propagandism*, now in *energetic* and almost *universal operation*, indisputably springs from the *False Prophet*, or the theological impostor of the Vatican¹."

¹ Letter, Episcopal Magazine, New Series, ii. 553.

CHAPTER LXXXIII.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM SKINNER, D.D.

BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1841.—Dr. Terrott elect of Edinburgh—his consecration. — Synod.—Bishop Skinner elected primus.—Pantonian professorship.—Christian Knowledge Society.—Letter from the bishop of Glasgow.—The Witness newspaper.—Consecration of churches at Portsoy —and Frasersburgh.—Inverness.—Aberdeen synod.—Dumfermline.—Ballyhulish. — Church society. — Trinity college.—Subscriptions.—Pastoral letter.—St. Paul's chapel, Aberdeen.—Strathbogie.—Ordination at Marnock.—Duke of Argyle's bill.—An interdict.—Parish of Culsamond.—Mr. Middleton.—Auchterarder.—Commission of the kirk.—
 1842.—Trinity college.—Primus's letter.—Christian Knowledge Society.—Blair-Gowrie—Dumfermline.—Hamilton.—Monument to bishop Walker.—Confirmation.—Church at Annan.—Glasgow.—Queen's visit.—Episcopal address to the queen—and to prince Albert.—Divine service in the palace.—Church at Helensburgh.—Church Society.—Bishop of Calcutta.—Church in Dunblane.—Drummond's schism.—Correspondence.—Meeting of the clergy.—Church in Dumfermline—in Porto-Bello.—Synod of Aberdeen. — Remarks.

1841.—ON THE DEATH of bishop Walker, the right rev. Dr. Torry, bishop of Dunkeld and Dunblane, but who is now styled bishop of St. Andrews, succeeded to the powers of the primus for the time being, in the terms of the second canon :—" That the church may suffer as little inconvenience as possible by the death or resignation of the primus, the *senior* bishop shall instantly succeed to his powers, until a majority of the bishops shall appoint one to the office by a formal deed of election." Bishop Torry sent his mandate to Dr. Terrott, then dean of Edinburgh, to convene his brethren within thirty days, in the most convenient place of the diocese, and, between the hours of eight in the morning and four in the afternoon, to elect a bishop for the diocese of Edinburgh. They met accordingly in St. Paul's Church, and

elected their dean, the very rev. Dr. Terrott, to be their bishop. Their choice was communicated to the primus for the time being, and approved of by his brethren. Bishop Torry appointed the elect to be consecrated at Aberdeen, on the 2d of June, in St. Andrew's church; and as it was necessary to elect a *primus* he summoned all the other bishops to meet him there on that day. The very rev. Charles Hughes Terrott, D.D. of Trinity College, Cambridge, was consecrated by bishop Torry of Dunkeld and Dunblane, on the 2d of June, assisted by bishop Skinner of Aberdeen, bishop Low of Ross and Argyle, bishop Russell of Glasgow, and bishop Moir of Brechin. On the same day, after the consecration, the bishops held an episcopal synod, and elected the right rev. Dr. Skinner, bishop of Aberdeen, their primus. The bishop of Edinburgh was appointed interim Pantonian professor of divinity; because events of the most important description being in progress, rendered any thing but a temporary appointment unnecessary. The primus and some of the other bishops proposed the rev. Patrick Cheyne for this responsible office; but as the contemplated college would make a new arrangement necessary when it came into full operation, bishop Terrott undertook its duties in the meantime¹.

IN THE JUNE MEETING of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the following interesting letter was read, from the bishop of Glasgow:—"I am again a suitor to the venerable society, in behalf of a colony of English workmen, who have settled in my district. About twelve miles from Glasgow there are very extensive fields of coal and iron-stone, on which, within the last few years, vast manufacturing establishments have been erected. As some of the processes in the iron line are quite new in this part of the kingdom, it was necessary to procure a better class of artisans from Staffordshire and other parts of England; and I am informed that, including their families, there are about a thousand of such persons now in the vicinity of Airdrie. Some, indeed, are methodists, and some are Roman catholics; but the majority belong to the church. As there is no episcopal chapel nearer than Glasgow they have applied to me for a place of worship. Indeed, some of them have declared, that if we do not provide accommodation for them and their children, where they can worship God according to the ritual of their own communion, they will return into England. I accordingly requested a

¹ Private Letter; Aberdeen Constitutional; Church of England Magazine, xl pp. iv. 8.

meeting of the masters and other gentlemen in the neighbourhood ; all of whom were so deeply impressed with the necessity of building an episcopal chapel, that the sum of £600 was immediately subscribed. One of the masters subscribed for himself alone £200, *and he is a presbyterian*. He confirmed to me the statement as to the great number of English at the several works ; and added, many of the men would subscribe out of their small means. We have got about £1000 ; but a building, however plain, large enough to contain 800 persons, will cost about £1800, so that we are still a great way short of the amount. On this occasion I plead for Englishmen and their families—objects of your more peculiar care. There are, besides these, a considerable number of Irish, chiefly miners, an inferior class of workmen ; but as there are many of them Romanists, they have *already* got a chapel built for them¹ !”

THE SOCIETY VOTED £200 for this church ; a circumstance which is furiously commented on by the Witness newspaper ; and that most worthy presbyterian, who acted the part of the kind Samaritan, and “ some of the leading promoters of this new place of worship,” are attacked as “ ferocious intrusionists, anxious, by this erection, to manifest their rage and spleen” against the kirk ! But, may we not rather say, they shewed their good will and charity towards men whom they had enticed from, and so deprived of, the means of grace, and who shewed their own good principles by desiring to sing the Lord’s song in a strange land, and who preferred Jerusalem in their mirth ? But mark the zeal of the papists for their idolatrous worship ; they had *already* built a chapel, even before the bishop of Glasgow had been applied to for his sanction. On St. John the Baptist’s day, the primus consecrated the new church of St. John the Baptist at Portsoy, in his own diocese. The incumbent, the rev. A. Cooper, and his congregation, deserve great commendation for their zeal and perseverance in collecting the sum necessary for the erection of this church. The church at Frasersburgh, dedicated to St. Peter, and built as a suitable monument to the late bishop Jolly, was also consecrated by the primus on the 4th of July. The rev. Patrick Cheyne, of St. John’s church, Aberdeen, preached the sermon ; the holy communion was administered, and, in the afternoon, twenty young persons were confirmed. The eastern window, filled with stained glass, is copied from a window in York minster. A lady of the congregation presented the altar

¹ Church of England Magazine, xi. 13.

with a crimson cloth embroidered in gold, together with a suitable chair, having a cross, entwined with the emblematic vine worked in the back. The hon. and rev. A. P. Percival, rector of East Horsley, gave a handsome subscription, and presented a splendid Prayer Book for the reading-desk, as a mark of that respect which he felt for the late bishop Jolly¹.

ON A SUNDAY in the end of July, an edifying and interesting scene presented itself in St. John's episcopal church, in the town of Inverness; when there were present an American prelate, the right rev. Dr. Meade, bishop of Virginia; two clergymen of English ordination, one of whom was the rev. Hugh Stowel of Manchester, and two of Scottish ordination; all of whom took part in the services of the day. This incident is worthy of being recorded, from its having been perfectly accidental. "The perfect harmony in which all these met together on common ground, 'in the unity of the Spirit, and in the bond of peace,' was pleasing and impressive in no ordinary degree²."

THE ANNUAL DIOCESAN synod of Aberdeen was held in August, when the primus, in his charge, expressed his gratification at the manner in which he had been received by his clergy and people, during his late triennial visitation of his diocese, and the great satisfaction with which he had observed the marked increase in the number of those brought for confirmation; and that many of them were adults, and therefore probably converts. He alluded to the admission of St. Paul's independent chapel to the church; to the increasing prosperity of the Church Society; to the proposed establishment of an Episcopal College; and to the lamented death of the late primus, on whom he pronounced a just and well-merited eulogium. At Dumfermline, in the diocese of St. Andrews, the foundation stone of an episcopal church was laid, with masonic honours, by D. Birrell, esq. master of St. John's Lodge, in the presence of lord Bruce, sir John Halkett, and other gentlemen, members of the church. The Christian Knowledge Society granted £200 towards erecting the new church at Ballyhulish Appin; and, as before mentioned, Mr. Stewart, the proprietor, built a parsonage, and granted a piece of ground for a glebe. This church is large enough to contain 1000 kneelings, and the estimated cost was only £700. In recommending this case to the benevolence of the society, the bishop of Argyle stated that he had "confirmed eighty-five

¹ Church of England Magazine, xi. 14.

² Inverness Journal; cited in the Church Intelligencer, i. 102.

candidates lately, on which occasion the number attending was so great that one-half could not find accommodation, while many who had gained admittance were dismissed, from apprehension of danger, in consequence of the ruinous state of the old church," which only contained 300 kneelings¹.

THE THIRD ANNUAL meeting of the Episcopal Church Society was held in Edinburgh, on December the 7th, the bishop of Ross and Argyle in the chair. The report was read by Mr. Ramsay, the secretary, from which it appears that there was a falling off in donations, and there were no legacies; but the congregational offerings were not diminished, and the annual subscriptions were increased. The sum of £774 had been applied to raise the incomes of 32 incumbents to the small amount of £80; £148 was paid to twelve schools; £100 for allowances to retired incumbents; £280 for the erection and repairs of churches; and £20 for Bibles, Prayer Books, and Testaments. Mr. Ramsay farther stated, that a new auxiliary committee had been formed in London, an association at Bridgenorth, and that contributions had been received from the bishops of Madras and Bombay, and from many of the laity in India².

AN EPISCOPAL SYNOD was held at Edinburgh in September, to take Mr. Gladstone's noble proposition for an Episcopal College into consideration; and a private correspondent says, "I imagine that with the meetings of this week has commenced *a new era* in the history of our church. The bishops did, indeed, at first, 'shew the cold shoulder' to Mr. Gladstone's magnificent scheme, startled by its very magnificence; but the great zeal and earnestness of that gentleman and his friend, Mr. Hope, warmed their feeble faith into life, and they resolved at least *to inquire* whether such an institution was wanted by the laity. Such was the object of a circular which had been extensively dispersed. The answers to it were reckoned, upon the whole, *favourable*; though several influential friends were opposed to it. The encouragement, however, was deemed sufficient for willing hearts to persevere; and Mr. Hope, who came down to meet the bishops on this occasion, announced that they were perfectly satisfied with the prospect of success offered to them, and waited only for the bishops to say the word. I had the honour to be present at the conference on Thursday last, when the bishops formally declared, by the mouth of the primus, their approbation of the scheme

¹ Church of England Magazine, xi.—Church Intelligencer, i. 245.

² Edinburgh Advertiser.

which God had put into the hearts of these two zealous laymen, in conjunction with certain others, to form ; and a provisional committee of lay persons was appointed to act, under the direction of the bishops, in taking the requisite preliminary steps. It is now fairly decided that the attempt shall be made, and there is every probability of its being carried to a successful issue." W. Gladstone, esq. sen. subscribed £1000, and his son, W. E. Gladstone, esq. £500. The marquis of Louthian gave £500 ; the queen dowager, £100 ; the bishop of Ross and Argyle subscribed £1000 ; the duke of Buccleugh, £1000 ; and others about £800, within the week after the proposal was made known. " It is proposed to locate the College near Perth. . . . A first-rate man from Oxford or Cambridge will be placed at its head, and the first thing is to be the building of a chapel. . . . So I leave you to speculate upon this prospect, merely adding, in conclusion, that there is now next to a certainty of recovering the ' Snell Exhibitions ' at Baliol College, Oxford, to the exclusive benefit of our church ¹." Mr. Snell's exhibitions have been long usurped by the presbyterian establishment, although they neither do, nor can, fulfil the conditions.

IN FOLLOWING UP this magnificent project, the bishops issued a pastoral letter, in the apostolical style, in their own names, introducing and recommending a brief development of the plan, and inviting the prayers, the alms, and the co-operation of all faithful people². The lay committee dis-

¹ Private Letter from a Clergyman, dated Edinburgh, September 4th, 1841.

² " TO ALL FAITHFUL MEMBERS of the reformed catholic church, the bishops in Scotland send greeting. Grace be with you, mercy and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

" WHEREAS, certain lay members of the church, moved by a pious desire to promote the glory of God and the welfare of the flock over which He hath made us Overseers, have represented unto us that our church, having been long depressed, hath suffered the total loss of temporal endowments, and that hence great difficulty hath been found in maintaining the decent administration of God's word and sacraments, more especially in so far as depends upon the due education of candidates for holy orders ; that the sense of this deficiency hath been frequently declared by various pious but inadequate bequests for this purpose, and more recently by the church herself, in the 40th canon ; and that the same still exists in almost undiminished magnitude : AND WHEREAS, they have represented unto us their desire, under God's blessing, to attempt a remedy for this want, and, in pursuance of such design, have proposed to us the foundation of a school and theological seminary, to be devoted to the training, under collegiate discipline, of candidates for holy orders ; and at the same time, of such other persons as may desire the benefit of a liberal, in conjunction with a religious, education : AND WHEREAS they have represented unto us, that sufficient pecuniary support hath been secured to warrant their perseverance in the design, and that they are now desirous, under our sanction, to make a public appeal to the members of the church in its behalf : NOW WE, THE BISHOPS of the reformed catholic church in Scotland, in synod assembled, desire to express our warmest gratitude to those with

disclaimed all party views, their object being perfectly plain; and having received the sanction of the bishops, they are acting in concert with them. The prelates submitted the proposals to the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and were favoured with their full approbation and encouragement.

ABOUT the beginning of December, the formal reception of the independent clergyman and congregation of St. Pauls, Aberdeen, took place, to the apparent satisfaction of the people. Sir Michael Bruce, bart. one of the managers, conveyed the earnest desire of the congregation that their bishop would preach in their chapel. With this request bishop Skinner complied; and he preached in St. Pauls on the 19th of December, when he made a most feeling address in reference to their recent union with the reformed catholic church of Scotland, of which they had then become members¹.

THIS WAS THE SEVENTH year of the ascendancy of the evangelical or ultra-Calvinistical party in the kirk; and, says Hetherington, "every thing indicated that the struggle between the church and *the world* was rapidly approaching to a crisis." In obedience to the law, to which both parties had appealed, the majority of the presbytery of Strathbogie, that had been suspended by the commission, appointed the 1st of January, at the kirk of Marnock, for the ordination and induction of Mr. Edwards. Notwithstanding a very heavy fall of snow on the preceding day, an immense crowd from neighbouring parishes met at Marnock, with the evident design of obstructing the proceedings. One of the lay elders demanded of the presbytery for what purpose, and by what authority, they had come. The moderator briefly intimated their business, when a legal protest was offered, disclaiming the jurisdiction of this part of the presbytery, and objecting to Mr. Edwards, both as to life and doctrine. Both the parishioners and the strangers then commenced a most

hom this proposal hath originated; and, above all, to God, who hath put into their hearts to attempt the supply of wants, the reality and urgency of which we have long painfully experienced; and having maturely considered the said design, we hereby FORMALLY APPROVE the same, and recommend it to you, our brethren in Christ, as a fitting object for your prayers and alms. We have farther, for the promotion of this good work, requested certain discreet persons to act in committee, and in concert with ourselves to prepare a scheme for its execution, to be submitted to the members of the church. In thus endeavouring to awaken your zeal and charity in behalf of that portion of the church committed to our charge, we deem it fitting to state solemnly and explicitly that we are moved by no feelings of rivalry towards any religious community, but by a desire to supply the wants of our own communion, and thereby to fulfil a duty implied in the first principles of the christian church.—Signed, William Aberdeen and Primus, and by all the other bishops."

¹ Church of England Magazine, xii.

disgraceful uproar, and endangered the lives of the ministers by throwing missiles of different sorts at them. This most unchristian conduct of the people has been worked up into fine dramatic effect by the ultra party; nevertheless, their conduct would have disgraced a horde of savages. The magistrates present with great difficulty protected the presbytery in the exercise of their office, and Mr. Edwards was duly admitted to the benefice, amidst the blasphemous and irreverent yells of the people. Hetherington calls this ordination an "atrocious deed," and rather rashly says, it is "a deed to which the annals of the church of Scotland can furnish no parallel." In March the commission referred their indictment against the seven Strathbogie men to the Assembly; and the notorious Dr. Candlish carried a vote of sympathy for the parishioners of Marnock, by a majority of twenty-two! The duke of Argyle brought a bill into the House of Lords, "to regulate the exercise of church patronage in Scotland; the principal object of which was, "that no pastor be intruded into a parish contrary to the will of the congregation." On the meeting of the Assembly, this bill was approved by a majority of one hundred and twenty-five. The seven Strathbogie ministers were *deposed* by a majority of ninety-seven; Mr. Edwards's settlement was declared null and void, and the four ministers constituting the minority of that presbytery were instructed to ordain and induct Mr. Henry as minister of Marnock. The deposed ministers applied to the Court of Session to protect them from the tyranny of their brethren; the court issued an interdict accordingly, and it was served upon the moderator of the Assembly whilst the court was sitting. Against the sentence of deposition, Mr. Cook, the leader of the defeated moderate party, offered a protest, in which he and those adhering to him declared that "they could not cease to regard these men as still ministers, just as if the proceedings against them had never been instituted although in the present case they c'd not submit to the judgment of the General Assembly, they would endeavour faithfully to discharge the duties which, as office-bearers in the established church, they were bound to perform¹." The deposed ministers experienced the sympathies of all political and religious parties, saving the predominant faction in the kirk courts. They continued, likewise, to exercise their ministry as usual; and they enjoyed the affectionate respect of their pa-

¹ Hetherington's History, 248-250.—Dublin Review, No. xxvii. 94.—Aberdeen Constitutional, and other Scotch Papers.

shioners and of their *moderate* brethren. On the Occasions, at the parochial sacraments, the moderate ministers from all parts of the kingdom hastened to shew their sympathy for the Strathbogie confessors, and to assist them at that ordinance.

THE PEOPLE, whose "inclinations" were said to be the fundamental charter of presbytery, had been for some time giving dreadful note of a very decided change in their affections. On the 11th of November, the ministers of the presbytery of Garrioch met, to induct Mr. Middleton to the parish of Culsamond, of which he had formerly been the curate; but the minority having determined to give effect to the distressing *veto*, which had been pronounced illegal, it was found necessary to procure the assistance of the sheriff-substitute, and other legal authorities, with a body of the rural police. A great multitude, chiefly strangers from other parishes, assembled at the kirk, and, with great noise and violence, prevented the presbytery from entering the edifice. At last, with great difficulty and much ill usage, the ministers, with Mr. Middleton, reached the elders' pew, and the legal authorities appeared in the front of the centre gallery; but they could make no impression on the rioters—their gesticulations could be seen, but nothing that they said could be heard. At last the ministers and Mr. Middleton forced their way through the rioters, and took shelter in the manse, where the usual ceremonies of induction took place. In the meantime, the rioters shewed the most sacrilegious contempt of the kirk; one fellow mounted the pulpit, and proposed to sing "Holy Willie's Prayer," one of Burns' most profane parodies upon the peculiar dogmas of the presbyterian Confession of Faith, whilst others sang obscene songs. They kept possession of the kirk the whole day and the greater part of the night; broke all the window-frames and glass, drank whiskey till they were intoxicated, smoked tobacco, broke up the seats, and committed indecencies not to be named,—"*some of the expressions made use of being so impiously profane, that we dare not repeat them.*" At last they nailed up the doors of the kirk, before they dispersed¹.

THE COURT OF SESSION granted an interdict, on the 9th of June, to prohibit the presbytery of Auchterarder from proceeding to the settlement of a minister in the pastoral charge of that parish, in opposition to Mr. Young, the legal presentee. The commission, which met on the 11th of August, ordered the presbyteries who had jurisdiction over those ministers who had assisted their Strathbogie brethren, "to institute disci-

¹ Aberdeen Constitutional.—Church Intelligencer, i. 349.

plinary proceedings, and to proceed in the matter according to the laws of the church." Against this decree, Dr. Cook, of St. Andrews, and Mr. Robertson, of Ellon, protested; and, among other reasons, they concluded,—“Because the resolution now sanctioned puts an end to all hope of devising any measure by which the members of the church might be united, and imposes upon us, and upon all who agree with us in the opinion which we have repeatedly expressed as to our present distressing condition, to take such steps as may appear most effectual for ascertaining, from competent authority, whether we who now dissent, and they who concur with us, or they who continue to set at nought the law of the land and the decisions of the supreme courts, in what we esteem *a civil right*, are to be held by the legislature of the country as constituting the established church, and as entitled to the privileges and endowments conferred by statute upon the ministers of that church.” The commission again met on the 25th of August, “when a series of resolutions were proposed” by the evangelicals, “promptly and decisively encountering the threatened danger, in asserting the *sacred principles* of the church, enumerating the aggressions that had been made by the civil courts on her constitutional and spiritual jurisdiction, declaring a calm and settled determination to maintain unimpaired those hallowed rights and privileges which are derived from the divine Redeemer alone, or to perish in their defence; yet, in the forgiving spirit of christianity, offering a conference with the erring brethren, if even now they might be reclaimed from their guilty and disastrous career!”¹ On the same evening there was a public meeting in the west kirk—an appropriate place!—when the necessity was referred to of “spreading abroad the dreadless and unconquered old blue banner on the free winds of heaven,” the ancient symbol of presbyterian rebellion.

1842.—THE SUBSCRIPTIONS for Trinity College were advancing satisfactorily, and the Primus wrote to the secretary of the Christian Knowledge Society as follows, to request their benevolent aid:—“Rev. and dear sir: I once more beg leave to solicit your very friendly aid in bringing under the notice of your venerable board the accompanying papers, relating to a plan of the very highest importance to the prosperity of the episcopal church in Scotland; and which we feel most deeply grateful, and at the same time proud to say,

¹ Hetherington's History, 250-253. — Aberdeen Constitutional, and other Newspapers.

et with the most marked approbation of the highest dignities of the church—their graces the archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, and Dublin. The bishops of the episcopal church in Scotland feel very sensibly the many liberations which have been from time to time most generously granted on their humble portion of the catholic church, by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the frequency of these grants makes them not a little reluctant in coming to renew their application. But the countenance and support of this most influential Society seem so indispensable to the success of their proposed establishment, that they do not hesitate humbly to solicit for it its favourable and respectful regard. In as far as can yet be ascertained, the prospect for the establishment of Trinity College has been entertained most favourably by the members of the episcopal church in Scotland. . . . I feel persuaded that it is wholly unnecessary for me to add one word more on the subject, either for your or the committee's satisfaction; the members of the Society, from past experience, am convinced will give their impartial and favourable attention to the papers now laid before them¹.” It is pleasing to record the munificence of £1000 by the Society, under certain restrictions to which there could be no objections. In the month of February, 1840 had been subscribed. Several sites were offered to the committee for the erection of the College; and, among others, Mr. Campbell, near Lochgilphead, in Argyleshire, offered a subscription of £3000 if they would erect the College in that neighbourhood. This offer, however, was declined, as the neighbourhood of Perth seems all along to have been the destined place. The prosperity of this scheme is wonderful, and it called forth a proportionate degree of jealousy and rancorous feeling on the part of the non-intrusionists in the kirk. The kirk generally, and the universities, notwithstanding, it, now when there could be no doubt of its success, gave considerable alarm, and accused the church of ingratitude and of making a bad return for their *tolerant conduct* towards the students of the church². The tolerance of the kirk in the present century has been recorded in these pages, and since that era, the quiet which the church has enjoyed has arisen, not from any spirit of toleration inherent in the kirk, but entirely from the knowledge that the church cannot afford to lose the kirk of the stipends, and also from a spirit of Lao-

¹ Church of England Magazine, xii.

² Private Letter, Feb. 22, 1842.

dicean lukewarmness and indifference to events, so long as the loaves and fishes of the establishment are safe.

TRINITY COLLEGE is to be capable of boarding and lodging about 200 youths, from eight to eighteen years of age; and to afford a sound clerical education to those that are destined for holy orders. In a letter to the Christian Knowledge Society, the bishop of Aberdeen writes,—“I am in hopes that the sum required for the erection of the buildings in the proposed College, if not already raised, will be speedily attained, and that Mr. Badeley, our secretary, will apply to your treasurers for the grant at no very distant date. It is truly wonderful to find, that in the short space of six months from the time that the College was brought before, and sanctioned by our Episcopal College, and even less, the vast sum of almost £15,000 should have been raised, in aid of our humble portion of Christ's catholic and apostolic church¹.” Upwards of a hundred individuals in the little village of Blair-Gowrie sent a requisition to Dr. Torry, bishop of St. Andrews, soliciting permission to form themselves into a congregation, in communion with the reformed catholic church. The bishop gave his hearty concurrence, and appointed the rev. John Marshall, formerly of St. Peter's church, Kirkcaldy, to officiate to them in the town-hall, which had been fitted up for their accommodation. The Rev. E. B. Field, of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, was appointed to the episcopal church now building in Dunfermline; and a church having been projected in Hamilton, the Rev. W. Henderson was inducted on the 14th July, and to which the duke of Hamilton has presented an organ. The clergy of the diocese of Edinburgh, the vestry of St. John's church, and some other gentlemen, erected an elegant monument in that church, to the memory of the late Primus and bishop of that diocese. It is pure Gothic and arched pannel, terminated by an ogee canopy, and supported by buttresses. The brackets and other enrichments were copied from Henry VIIth's Chapel in Westminster Abbey, and the whole is in perfect ecclesiastical character. On the centre of the pannel is a shield of pure Carrara marble, surmounted by a mitre in bold relief, containing the inscription.

THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH held an ordination in St. Paul's church, in that city, in the month of April, when, to an extraordinary number to whom that rite was administered, there were added about an hundred soldiers of the 53d regiment, in their

¹ Church of England Magazine, xii.

uniforms ;—an auspicious sign of the times. The bishop of Glasgow recommended the application of the rev. J. Irving, incumbent of the episcopal church at Annan, then building, to the Christian Knowledge Society, when they generously voted £50 for that object. The bishop writes :—“ Mr. Irving has, for the last twelve months, done duty gratuitously to the scattered episcopalians at Annan, a town about seven miles from the border, and situated on the Solway firth. Being so near England, there are many natives of that country resident in the neighbourhood ; and the chief trade (for it has a port) being with the Cumberland shore, there are always some seafaring persons in the town on Sunday. I have obtained from the gentlemen engaged in this undertaking an assurance that twenty or thirty free seats shall be set apart for sailors and other strangers from the south. The subscriptions, considering the means of the people, are much beyond what we expected ; but we look to your venerable and most useful Society for aid. As it happens that my district extends along the border from the Solway Firth to Coldstream, near Berwick, I have more English persons to provide for than any other Scottish bishop.” In May, the bishop of Glasgow confirmed 230 young persons in St. Jude’s church, Glasgow ; admitted two gentlemen to the order of priests, and held his triennial visitation in St. Mary’s church. From being hitherto the hotbed of the Covenant and of presbyterianism, the diocese of Glasgow has more rapidly advanced in catholic principles than any other part of Scotland. Since the writer can remember, there was only one episcopal church in Glasgow, and the remains of an old congregation that met in an apartment of the grammar school. There are now four large churches in the city of Glasgow (but “one is not”), and ten others in different places of that diocese¹. When Mr. Wade opened an apartment in Paisley, there were only fourteen souls that met there in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship ; now he has erected a large church, has a numerous congregation, and this year 120 persons were confirmed in it. These are God’s doings, and they are marvellous in our eyes, and shew what might be effected by the Church Society, were it enabled to extend its pecuniary assistance to the clergy, in forming new congregations in places where only “two or three” might be gathered together in Christ’s name. The lump might soon be leavened, were the subscriptions to this excellent fund more liberal, and if the

¹ Church of England Magazine, xii.

governors of that church would fulfil the Chief Bishop's command to make disciples of every willing presbyterian creature.

IN THE AUTUMN of this year her majesty and prince Albert paid a visit to Scotland, and resided at Dalkeith palace, the chief seat of the duke of Buccleugh. She was most cordially and affectionately welcomed to her ancient kingdom. Addresses from all parties were presented to her majesty and to her royal consort, and the reformed catholic church was not deficient in shewing their constitutional loyalty, by presenting the following loyal address to the queen :—

“MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,—We, your majesty's loyal and devoted subjects, the bishops and clergy of the Scottish episcopal church, gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity afforded by your majesty's visit to this your ancient kingdom, to renew our expression of grateful attachment to your majesty's government and person. Taught by our church, as she is taught by the word of God, to honour the sovereign and obey the laws, we consider it as a cause of special thankfulness that the sovereign whom we are called upon to honour is worthy of all honour, on personal as well as official grounds, and that thus the strictest performance of our duty is entirely a labour of love. We beg gratefully to acknowledge your majesty's kindness to our church in according your royal assent and sanction to the act by which we have been brought into closer connection with the church of England, and declared to be what we have always considered ourselves—one with her in all that relates to our spiritual character and offices. And we beg to assure your majesty that we shall endeavour to shew our grateful sense of such favour by labouring in our ministry to inculcate the duties of obedience to the laws, and of loyal and respectful attachment to your majesty. That Providence may continue to exercise that gracious protection by which your majesty's life and person have been guarded from the violence of wicked men; that you may be blessed in your kingdom and in your family; and that under your fostering care true religion may flourish in our land, and bring forth its proper fruits of order, peace, and mutual love between all ranks and conditions of men, is the sincere prayer of your majesty's loyal and devoted subjects.” Signed by the Primus and all the bishops.

A CONGRATULATORY address was also presented to prince Albert, signed by all the bishops, and both addresses were graciously received. The excitement in the ultra non-

intrusion party in the kirk was at this time very great, and her majesty's advisers thought it would not be prudent for the queen to afford them a triumph over their more respectable brethren by going to any of the established places of worship. Her majesty therefore chose to have divine service in Dalkeith palace, and the very Rev. E. B. Ramsay, dean of Edinburgh, and incumbent of St. John's, had the honour of officiating in the palace, and of preaching to her majesty and suite. The moderate party acknowledged the propriety of this arrangement; but the ultras made an enormous outcry, and based on it a furious attack upon their brethren and the catholic church. They said they could have borne with her majesty's bringing one of her own chaplains from England; but to appoint a clergyman of the despised and pitiful remnant of the reformed catholic church of Scotland was an insult never to be forgiven. Its principles, they said, "are fundamentally popish, as we shall be ready to make good against all opposers; and if our countrymen are content that it should be the national religion, they may be lighting their wax tapers, and erecting their crucifixes as fast as they please. But if there linger yet in Scottish breasts one spark of that love to presbytery, and *heart-hatred to prelacy*, which burned in the bosoms of their ancestors, they will not allow the ministers, who have put this studied and intentional slight on the Scottish church, to leave the country without some public demonstration how keenly they feel the insult that has thus been put upon the ancient kingdom of Scotland¹."

THE BISHOP OF GLASGOW again applied to the Christian Knowledge Society in favour of the new episcopal church at Helensburgh, in the county of Dumbarton, and was favoured with a grant of £20. He wrote—"Helensburgh is a watering-place about twenty miles from Glasgow, much frequented in summer; and as we had not till lately any place of worship, our people, when there, wandered from place to place, and gradually lost all church feeling. But my petition to you respects not the wealthier classes chiefly, though an episcopal chapel at Helensburgh was even on their account a great desideratum: there are in the neighbourhood, especially at Dumbarton, large public works, where many English and Irish artizans are employed; and I am assured that the church we are building will prove to them a material accommodation. A number of free seats are to be set apart for them. This is the seventh new congregation formed in my district within five years; and it is pleasant to add, that they are all prospering.

¹ Scottish Guardian, cited in Church Intelligencer, i. 1068.

We are arranging matters for a chapel at Jedburgh, a small town within a few miles of the Northumbrian border; but in this case the noble families of Buccleuch and Lothian have been so liberal, that we shall not have occasion to tax your generosity."

THE ANNUAL MEETING of the Church Society was held in Edinburgh, on December the 7th, when the bishop of Glasgow took the chair. After prayers, the very rev. E. B. Ramsay, the secretary, read a report of the last year's proceedings; from which it appeared that the congregational offerings in Scotland amounted to £1020, the subscriptions to £811, and donations only to £166. In collections, donations, and subscriptions, from England, Ireland, and the colonies, the Society had received £450, including, however, a donation of £100 from the lord primate of Ireland. The Society had again raised the clerical incomes of 32 incumbents to the low minimum of £80, the schools formerly mentioned were maintained, and some assistance was afforded to those congregations whose churches and parsonage houses required repair. A letter from Dr. Wilson, the lord bishop of Calcutta, and metropolitan of India, was read, in which his lordship promised a remittance of a thousand rupees, and expressed his interest in the welfare and prosperity of the church in Scotland in the warmest terms. This Society might be the means of extending the church in every direction, by affording stipends to the clergy in newly formed congregations, till they are enabled to raise a sufficient stipend; but the minimum might and ought to be raised to £100, and even that is too little for an educated man with a family depending on him. The Rev. B. F. Couch, late curate of Hampstead, Middlesex, was licensed by the bishop of Dunkeld and Dunblane to minister to a congregation that had been formed in the city of Dunblane in a temporary place, till funds can be realized to build a church¹.

IN THE MONTH of October this year, a disgraceful schism took effect that had been secretly working for many years. A Mr. D. T. K. Drummond, who is a vain, weak man, but one of the *self*-styled evangelical class of preachers, had long given the late bishop Walker much uneasiness by holding what he called prayer-meetings in a public hall, in direct contravention of the 28th canon, which prohibits every clergyman from officiating or preaching in any place publicly without using the liturgy. He had obstinately persevered in extemporising in Clyde Street Hall, and other places, in spite of the private remonstrances of

the late bishop Walker. He was present when his brother-in-law, Mr. Hutton, a priest of the diocese of Rochester, officiated extemporaneously for the established presbyterian minister of Comry, in Perthshire, in the year 1836 ; and in 1837, he himself repeatedly extemporised and preached for the parish minister of Craig, near Montrose, in the diocese of Brechin, and at Usan and Budden, two parochial preaching stations. He seemed to think that he had been ordained as a missionary *at large*, and to be uncontrollable and irresponsible in his conduct ; whereas the ordination service limits him and all other priests to “ the congregation where they shall be lawfully appointed.” In addition to these most reprehensible irregularities, he continued, notwithstanding the remonstrances of his brethren, to collect crowds in Clyde Street Hall of all denominations, and to extemporise to them. He is a weak-minded man, and vain-glory is his besetting sin, which has rendered him worthy of the most profound contempt. The conduct of this “ wandering star ” had now become so notoriously schismatical, “ presumptuous, and self-willed,” that the whole church called on bishop Terrott to exercise his just authority. Accordingly, the bishop of Edinburgh wrote to Drummond, on the 3d of October, on the subject of his ministrations in Clyde Street Hall, which are conducted without the use of the liturgy of our church. The bishop pointed out the irregularity of such ministrations, and their decided infraction of the act of uniformity, and of the canons of the Scottish church, which he had subscribed and sworn to obey. The bishop concluded his letter with these words—“ I beg, then, rev. and dear sir, that you will consider *this* as an *admonition* in terms of the canon ; and I hope you will find it possible to preach the gospel without violating the law of the church.” After prohibiting extemporising, the canon says, an irregular clergyman “ shall, for the first offence, be *admonished* by his bishop, and if he persevere in this uncanonical practice, shall be *suspended* until after due contrition he be restored to the exercise of his clerical functions.” Instead, however, of receiving the godly admonition of his superior in a proper spirit, he returned a most impertinent letter ; and, without answering his bishop’s letter, he demanded answers in the style of a superior to five or six captious questions about other irregularities, which had not been previously known, but in which he evidently gloried, and thus endeavoured to entrap the bishop into some imprudent concession. Drummond persisted in following his schismatical course, and to save himself from the disgrace which he well merited, of being suspended, to which he saw his contumacy must

ultimately lead, he resigned his cure of Trinity Church, and, *ipso facto*, excommunicated himself¹.

MR. DRUMMOND had the bad taste to publish his correspondence with bishop Terrott; in consequence the clergy of the diocese met in the episcopal library, the dean in the chair, on the 1st of November, when they passed some resolutions, together with a remonstrance, in which they style Drummond, by an excess of courtesy, "brother." He had publicly announced his intention of setting up an independent meeting in opposition to the church, and he invited all "Scottish episcopalians and members of the church of England" to join it. In their first resolution the clergy state—"That after having carefully read the correspondence between the right reverend the bishop and the rev. Mr. Drummond, as published by the latter, it is our opinion that in this case the *separation* of Mr. Drummond from the Scottish episcopal church *is totally without cause*, inasmuch as the principle for which he says that he is contending, and which he twice defines as meaning, that he shall be at liberty to invite *his own people* in any *private room*, for private social worship, *where-soever and whensoever he pleases*, without being compelled to use the liturgy, has not in the slightest degree been infringed upon: his ministrations in Clyde-street Hall having been brought under the censure of the canon, not because they were *private social* prayer meetings of *his own people* for *private* social worship in a *private* room, but because in them he was *publicly* officiating without using the liturgy at all. And we would add, in consequence of the proposal to invite him to continue his ministrations in Edinburgh, disconnected from the Scottish episcopal church, that even if the principle for which he says he is contending had been interfered with in this, or in any other instance, still this could not justify the sin of schism²." In short, they made him of too much importance, and inflated his vanity to such a degree, that even if he had been specially allowed to do as he says he thought himself entitled to do "*wheresoever and whensoever HE PLEASED*," which is the very essence of the "gainsaying of Core," he would not have resigned the eclat of giving his name to a *new sect*. Drummond appealed from his bishop to his own partisans and to the public, having none other or better to whom to appeal. But, says a presbyterian contemporary,

¹ Correspondence between the Right Rev. C. H. Terrott and the Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, *passim*.

² Church Intelligencer, i. 1181.

“ we candidly state our opinion, that reason, the laws of the church, and ecclesiastical authority, are all on the side of bishop Terrott; while, on the part of Mr. Drummond, we can discover nothing but an *overweening self-conceit and complacency*, which makes him fly in the face of sober episcopal reproof, though administered in the gentlest terms, and, we fear, renders him incapable of understanding or feeling the beauty and truth of the great principle of his church, that ‘ order is heaven’s first law ¹.’ ”

THE NEW episcopal church at Dunfermline was consecrated by the bishop of Glasgow, acting for Dr. Torry, the bishop of St. Andrews, on the 25th of October, assisted by the bishop of Edinburgh, and a numerous retinue of the clergy of Edinburgh. The church itself is of the early Gothic order, and cruciform, and contains 350 kneelings, but is capable of accommodating more if required. The chancel window is large, of stained glass, and has been pronounced superior to any thing of the kind in the kingdom. The bishop of Edinburgh preached a powerful sermon, and the services of the day concluded with the administration of the eucharist to above fifty communicants². St. Mark’s church, Portobello, was built on speculation by a dissenter, and let on lease to the clergyman and his vestry; the lease falling in this year, the proprietor, without more ado, shut up the church, under pretence of repairing it! The congregation were therefore obliged to meet in a temporary place, which was duly licensed by the bishop of Edinburgh; a new vestry was appointed, and measures were taken to procure another church, rather than be subjected to similar inconvenience and imposition for the future. The proprietor immediately procured the services of an unlicensed clergyman, but who was prohibited from officiating by the bishop. The bishop, however, unfortunately, sanctioned a vestry appointed by this same dissenting proprietor, against which the incumbent and his vestry most respectfully appealed to the next episcopal synod³. When the synod met, the bishops reversed the bishop of Edinburgh’s decision in this case.

AT THE ASSEMBLY in May, that Court suspended all those ministers that had assisted the Strathbogie ministers at their several communion Occasions. These men were chiefly in the presbytery of Garrioch, and other presbyteries within the bounds of the synod of Aberdeen. At the half-yearly

¹ Edinburgh Evening Post.

² Church Intelligencer, i. 1189.

³ Church Intelligencer, vol. i. 934.

meeting of that synod, in October, an attempt was made to reject the suspended ministers from sitting in the synod; but that court, by a majority of ten, refused to give effect to the sentence of the Assembly, and retained their names on the roll of the synod¹.

THAT SPIRIT OF SCHISM and division was powerfully at work at this time, which was engendered by one of the three Unclean Spirits issuing severally from the mouths of the Dragon, the Wild Beast, and the *False Prophet*, namely, popish propagandism. There is no doubt but that jesuits, and other popish emissaries, were as busily employed in sowing the tares of division and "disruption" in the "best reformed kirk in the world," as they had been in all former periods of her history. They have also assisted in bringing that apostacy from the church to maturity which has been related in this chapter, as they are also busily at work at their old tricks in exciting popular antipathy in England to the use of the surplice in the pulpit. They like to fish in troubled waters; and the present proceedings of the jesuits are exactly the same as those of the same unclean spirits of all evil previous to the grand rebellion. May it please God to save and deliver us from their diabolical machinations, "to abate their pride, assuage their malice, and confound their devices," that the Anglo-Catholic Church, in all its branches, "being armed with God's defence, may be preserved evermore from all perils, to glorify Him who is the only giver of all victory," and of all peace and godliness!

¹ Scotsman newspaper, cited in Church Intelligencer, i. 1166.

CHAPTER LXXXIV.

**PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REVEREND WILLIAM SKINNER, D.D.,
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,**

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

1843. — St. Peter's church, Kirkcaldy. — Blair-Gowrie — Airdrie — Forres — Cruden. — Synod of Aberdeen. — Mr. Allan, of Monymusk. — Rev. Sir W. Dunbar. — Act of excommunication. — Rev. D. Bagot. — Bishop of Ross and Argyle. — Bishop of Glasgow. — The national communion-office. — Diocese of Moray, Ross, and Argyle — of Glasgow. — Bishop of Edinburgh — of Aberdeen. — Cruden. — Court of Session. — Sir James Graham's letter. — General Assembly. — "The disruption" — transactions. — Baptist Noel. — Rev. J. Alexander. — Church Society. — Trinity church, Haddington. — St. Paul's School. — Bishop Terrott. — Church at Jedburgh — built — description — consecrated — the services. — Remarks.

1843. — IN THE YEAR 1818 a very small chapel was erected in Kirkcaldy, in the diocese of St. Andrews, at which time the number of communicants did not exceed twelve; but the increase had been so steady, that it was now found necessary to erect a church of larger dimensions. The expense of this building was estimated at £1000, of which £500 had been subscribed in January, when the vestrymen, with the concurrence and approbation of the bishop of St. Andrews, petitioned the Christian Knowledge Society. With their usual liberality, the society agreed to a grant of £50 towards the erection of St. Peter's church, in Kirkcaldy, and the Church Society also made a liberal grant¹. On the 6th of April the new episcopal church at Helensburgh, in the diocese of Glasgow, was opened for divine service, and bishop Russell inducted the Rev. J. R. Mackenzie to the pastoral charge of the congregation.

ON WEDNESDAY, the 29th of March, the newly-erected church of St. Catherine's, in Blair-Gowrie, was opened for

¹ Church of England Magazine — Church Intelligencer, ii. 26, 273.

public worship, under the license of the bishop of St. Andrews. There was a full complement of the neighbouring clergy, and a great concourse of presbyterians, to witness the service. "Throughout, not only the seats, but also the aisles in the nave of the edifice, were densely crowded; many persons who had come from a distance to attend the solemnity having been disappointed of obtaining admittance." On the 4th of May the bishop of Glasgow consecrated the new church of St. John's, at Coat Bridge, near Airdrie, before mentioned; the incumbent, the Rev. H. Kennedy, in the name of the trustees, presented the petition; the morning prayers were read by the Rev. W. S. Wilson, of Trinity church, Ayr, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. Robert Montgomery, of St. Jude's church, Glasgow. The Rev. Alexander Ewing collected a small sum for the enlargement of the episcopal church at Forres, the congregation of which is steadily increasing. The only remains of the original place of worship there in which bishop Falconar officiated, is an old communion cup, with the following inscription:—"Presented to the church in this place, *now under cloud*, 1746." Probably this interesting relic might have been the gift of bishop Falconar, who was consecrated in the year 1741, and whilst the church was certainly under a cloud. The original church of St. James's, Cruden, was found to be in such a dilapidated state as to be in danger of falling down: by great exertions the incumbent, Mr. Pratt, author of the "Old Paths," collected a sufficient sum, by subscription, to erect a handsome Gothic edifice on the site of the old one, the foundation-stone of which was laid with masonic honours on the 24th of April¹.

THE ANNUAL DIOCESAN synod of Aberdeen met at that city on the 9th of August. In addition to the usual business of the synod, bishop Skinner drew the attention of his clergy to various points of heretical doctrine, which the Rev. Alexander Allan, of Monymusk, had promulgated, in a "Lecture on the Distinctive Characters and relative Bearings of Theological parties in the Christian Church," in the episcopal church at Inverary, in the preceding month of March, and which he had subsequently published. The bishop laid a copy of his correspondence with Mr. Allan on this subject before the synod, and appointed a committee to consider the case, and to report to the synod. The committee reported, that Mr. Allan's lecture contained much that was highly censurable, as being at variance with the teaching of the holy catholic church in

¹ Church of England Magazine, 1843—Church Intelligencer, ii. 373.

general, and with the Scottish branch of it in particular. The committee found some difficulty in determining whether or not these heretical passages were Mr. Allan's own opinions, or merely a narrative of the opinions of others; but the committee had no hesitation in expressing their opinion, that Mr. Allan was guilty of very great indiscretion in making subjects of such grave importance the matter of a discourse to a christian congregation, while he expressed himself so vaguely as to leave his hearers in great doubts as to what he recommended to them as the truth, and what he cited as merely the opinions of sects and parties; "and of something even much more censurable, if any importance is to be attached to the notice prefixed to his lecture, which would seem to implicate Mr. Allan *as individually maintaining* certain views set forth in it." Mr. Allan's whole discourse seemed to be based on a denial of that article of the Creed, "I believe in one catholic and apostolic church," and assumes, that the catholic church consists of all sects and parties. "The report was unanimously approved of by the synod, and adopted by the bishop as his judicial decision in the case¹."

BISHOP SKINNER also laid before his synod a correspondence into which he had been drawn by another schismatic, the Rev. Sir William Dunbar, minister of St. Paul's chapel, in Aberdeen. When Sir William accepted the charge of St. Paul's, the congregation were in full communion with the reformed Catholic church, and the exclusive use of the English communion office in the administration of the eucharistic sacrament was conceded to them. In the course of the spring the bishop of Aberdeen held an ordination in his own church of St. Andrews, at which Sir William was requested to preach. He did so; but in the vestry, immediately before the service commenced, he informed his bishop that he could not receive the communion on that occasion, because it was consecrated and administered by the national form; accordingly, when his sermon was finished, he walked out of the church without communicating, objecting, as he afterwards said, "on scriptural grounds, to administer or unite in the service." For this daring act of contumacy his bishop admonished him without effect; for, on the 12th of May, he wrote to the bishop:—"I am constrained to withdraw my reserved and limited subscription to the canons of the Scottish episcopal church. . . . I now withdraw my subscription referred to, and . . . I claim to be henceforth considered *exempt* from all jurisdiction, whether

¹ Church Intelligencer, ii. 827—Dublin Review.

diocesan, synodical, or any other, of the Scottish episcopal church." I deeply regret that space cannot be afforded for the whole of this correspondence, which, on the part of the schismatic, is replete with ignorance, presumption, and self-conceit. On the other hand, the bishop's letters are firm, conciliatory, and dignified, and they are a complete specimen of that vigour and promptitude which such an unprecedented case required. By the advice of this synod, the Primus formally excommunicated Sir William Dunbar, and directed the following Declaration to be read from the altar of every church within his diocese, after the Nicene Creed, on Sunday the 13th of August, being the ninth Sunday after Trinity:—

IN THE NAME OF GOD. AMEN.—WHEREAS, the Rev. Sir William Dunbar, Bart., late minister of St. Paul's chapel, Aberdeen, and a presbyter of this diocese, received by letters dimissory from the lord bishop of London, forgetting his duty as a priest of the Catholic church, did, on the 12th day of May last, in a letter addressed to us, William Skinner, D.D. bishop of Aberdeen, wilfully renounce his canonical obedience to us his proper ordinary, and withdraw himself, as he pretended, from the jurisdiction of the Scottish episcopal church; and notwithstanding our earnest and affectionate remonstrances, repeatedly addressed to him, did obstinately persist in that his most undutiful and wicked act, contrary to his ordination vows, and his solemn promise of canonical obedience, whereby the said Sir W. Dunbar hath violated every principle of duty which the laws of the Catholic church have recognised as binding on her priests, and hath placed himself in a state of open schism: And whereas, the said Sir William Dunbar hath moreover continued to officiate in defiance of our authority; therefore we, William Skinner, Doctor in Divinity, bishop of Aberdeen aforesaid, sitting with our clergy in synod, this tenth day of August, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, and acting under the provisions of Canon XLI., do declare that the said Sir William Dunbar hath ceased to be a presbyter of this church, and that all his ministerial acts are without authority, as being performed apart from Christ's mystical Body, wherein the One Spirit is; and we do most earnestly and solemnly warn all faithful people to avoid all communion with the said Sir William Dunbar in prayer and sacraments, or in any way giving countenance to him in his present irregular and sinful course, lest they be partakers with him in his sin, and thereby expose themselves to the threatening denounced against those

who cause divisions in the church; from which danger we most heartily pray that God, of his great mercy, would keep all the faithful people committed to our charge, through Jesus Christ our Lord.—Amen.

THE SPIRIT OF SCHISM seems to have predominated in the north, under the influence that the jesuits have acquired since the year 1829. The Drummond schismatics required a place of worship, and it occurred to them to oust the Rev. D. Bagot from St. James's chapel, where it was supposed there would be a considerable number of sympathisers. The vestry accordingly assumed the office of judges, and called on Mr. Bagot to reconcile a protestant catechism of his own composition, and highly Calvinistical, with the national communion service, and to explain to them his views of that service. In Mr. Bagot's reply, these self-constituted judges pretended to have discovered that he was a papist at heart, and under this unjust accusation they made the most vexatious exertions, by harassing him with legal processes, and by the most wanton insults, to oust him from the chapel. He maintained a successful warfare against the schismatics, and they were at last obliged to build a conventicle to contain all those so-called episcopalians who despised dominion, spoke evil of dignities, and had only entered the *outward courts* of the Lord's house for the sake of convenience or fashion.

ON THE FEAST of St. James the apostle, the bishop of Ross and Argyle held an ordination at his church of St. John the Evangelist, Pittenweem, for the admission of the Rev. D. Mackenzie to the priesthood, and to serve at the church at Portnacroish, near Appin, in Argyleshire; and at the same time he confirmed several young persons. On the 18th of August the bishop of Glasgow held an ordination in St. James's church, Leith, when he admitted a Mr. Smith to the order of deacons. Bishop Russell ordained Mr. Smith, by desire of Dr. Onderdonck, bishop of New York, whose testimonials Mr. Smith brought along with him from that city. The schismatical spirit seemed at this evil time to be increasing; for a nearly simultaneous movement was made in the dioceses of Moray and Glasgow, in opposition to that goodly treasure of Catholic doctrine—the national communion office. At the diocesan synod of Ross and Argyle, held in St. John's church, Inverness, at which the very reverend Charles Fyvie, the dean, presided, the Rev. A. Ewing, of Forres, moved—“That it is desirable there should be no longer any difference in the mode of administering the holy communion, between

the episcopal church of Scotland and the united church of England and Ireland, and that the bishops of the former church be memorialised to take the necessary steps for the cancelling the 21st Canon, with that view." This *unfaithful* and unfilial motion was appropriately seconded by the Rev. J. D. Hull, of Huntly, a man who has since identified himself with the excommunicated Dunbar, of Aberdeen, by having preached in his conventicle. It appears that this unhappy proposal "was cordially entertained by the assembled clergy, and passed unanimously," and thus they cast away a treasure—"their brightest star"—their *birthright*—of which it appears they are *not worthy*. In this extensive diocese there are now only two clergymen who have preserved their integrity, and who shew a noble example of steadfastness in the faith—the Rev. John Murdoch, at Keith, and the Rev. James Smith, at Aberchirder, *alias* St. Marnochskirk, both in the county of Banff¹. The unfilial movement in Glasgow was the act of four clergymen of English ordination, who being unable to procure employment in their native church, took shelter in the Catholic church of Scotland, and requited the promotion they had obtained in her, to the unjust exclusion of her own sons, by thus fulfilling the Scripture—"He that eateth bread with me, hath lifted up his heel against me." These four clergymen sent a long memorial to their bishop, stating, among many other things, that the national eucharistic office "is daily becoming a sore stumbling-block in the way of our congregations: it is a positive *offence* to many!" They prayed that this rock of offence might be removed out of the way, although it was not used in the whole diocese, and the offence was a mere affair of the imagination; for not one of these clergymen had ever been present in any church which enjoyed the blessed privilege of using it. The memorial is signed George Almond, incumbent of St. Mary's; Isaac Hitchen, assistant of St. Mary's; L. P. Mercier, officiating minister of St. Andrew's; Robert Montgomery, minister of St. Jude's².

IN CONSIDERATION of the danger to thoughtless members of the church, the bishop of Edinburgh addressed "A Dissuasive from Schism" to the lay members of his diocese, in consequence of the unceasing efforts of the schismatics to draw the members of the church into their conventicle. Bishop Terrott, in a mild and affectionate manner, warns his

¹ Private information.

² Church Intelligencer, i. 1025—Church of England Magazine, vol. xv.

flock of the danger of schism, and describes in what it consists, and the sinfulness of it, to the meanest capacity. He happily meets a very common excuse for the guilt of schism by shewing the fallacy of arguing from the example of the Reformation. "The separation commonly called the Reformation was not a sinful schism on the part of our fathers, because (*inter alia*) the Romish church was [and is] idolatrous; and the maintenance of the separation is not schismatical, because the Council of Trent, the last *general* council, as it is *falsely* called, refused to acknowledge, and abate the evil." The bishop acknowledges what has already been asserted here, that "those who have left us were never really of us—that they never had an earnest conviction of the duty of upholding a communion apart from the great mass of their presbyterian fellow-citizens, any more than they now have a sufficient reason for upholding an English chapel for Scottish christians. The loss of such *nominal* members, whatever may be their personal respectability, can be no loss to the church; nor do they themselves suffer any great loss by the abandonment of *privileges*, which they neither *used nor valued*." It is to be hoped that this excellent Dissuasive had the desired effect upon the minds of the real members of the church—that both used and valued the blessed privileges which they have obtained through holy baptism.

ON THURSDAY, THE 16th of November, the bishop of Aberdeen, assisted by a considerable number of his clergy, consecrated the new church of St. James, Cruden. An enclosed piece of ground round the church was also consecrated for the purpose of christian burial, and it is proposed to hang a bell in the spire of this church, which serves as a land-mark to ships at sea. St. James's Church is built in the early English style, having long narrow lancet windows with alternate buttresses, and a spire about ninety feet high. The internal arrangements of this plain but appropriate structure are all carefully studied. The entrance is in the west end, with a centre aisle leading to the chancel, which is elevated three steps above the body of the church, and contains the altar, a prothesis, and sedilia. The east window is composed of equal lancets of finely stained glass, with various, very rich, and appropriate symbols of the church, chastely subdued to a tone of great harmony and beauty. The pulpit and reading stall, which contains a lectern and prayer desk, are placed on the steps on each side of the chancel. The earl of Errol, who is the patron, with his countess, have nobly contributed to this pious work, which will cause their names, with those

on recovering from their surprise, the remaining members voted Dr. Halden into the chair, until a moderator should be elected. Their choice fell on Dr. Macfarlane, principal of the College of Glasgow, when the ordinary business of the Assembly went on as if no such breaking up had occurred. The Assembly set themselves to repeal those acts that had been illegally made during the dominance of the ultra party with the assistance of the *quoad sacra* ministers. They repealed the veto act, reponed the suspended ministers of Strathbogie to their legal status and ministerial functions, and their sentence of suspension was declared to be *ab initio* null and void. The act of Assembly also by which ministers of chapels of ease and seceding bodies became members of the General Assembly was repealed. On the motion of Dr. Cook, the Assembly came to the resolution that the protesting ministers "have, by their *own act*, ceased to be ministers of the church of Scotland; that their churches have become vacant; and that they are disqualified for receiving any presentation or appointment to a parochial or other spiritual charge in this church, as by law established, till reponed by the competent ecclesiastical judicatories; and that the subscribing elders are no longer elders in any of the parishes or sessions connected with the establishment." These acts proclaimed peace betwixt the government and the establishment; the vacant livings were filled up from among the long-expectant probationers, and the quiet, well-disposed ministers of the establishment, got rid of a swarm of hornets that had stung them nearly to dissolution ever since the death of their last powerful and respectable leader, Dr. John Inglis¹.

AMONG THE PORTENTOUS SIGNS of the times we must here record an act of treachery to the church general, and of insult to that branch of it which is now beginning to evangelise the whole land. Under the influence of the *principle of infidelity*, which is one of the three *Unclean Spirits* which have arisen out of the bottomless pit, the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, in *habit* a minister of the church of England, but in *heart* a most latitudinarian dissenter, being on a visit to his brother-in-law, Evan Baillie, Esq. of Dochfour, officiated several times in the parish kirk of Inverness. Betwixt the kirk and St. John's episcopal church there is only the breadth of Church Street, a space so slight as not to prevent the sound of the voices of both parties from being mutually heard. This monstrous act of schism was on the part of the presbyterian minister a direct

¹ Edinburgh Advertiser.—Church Intelligencer, *passim*.

violation of the act of Assembly of 1799, by which all preachers not in communion with the establishment were peremptorily prohibited from entering their pulpits. Whatever private admonition may have been administered to the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, it is to be lamented that the bishop of London has taken no *public* steps to punish him for an act for which, in the primitive church, he would have been excommunicated.

THE REV. J. ALEXANDER was appointed to the church of St. Paul's, Carrubbers Close, in Edinburgh, which had been formerly occupied by a low churchman, who has since separated from the church. By his zeal and personal exertions Mr. Alexander sought out the desolate members of the church in all the alleys of the Old Town, and filled the church with those who had been excluded by the rich from the communion of saints. When he commenced his incumbency in 1842, he succeeded a low latitudinarian; the eucharist was only celebrated every second month; but he now administers that sacrament weekly, and the number of communicants is nearly three times as great as it was when he was inducted. He has also collected about eighty poor children, who are educated and instructed in the doctrines of the catholic church, and who are taught to chant the psalms and anthems. It is now proposed to erect another church in the Old Town, with extensive accommodation for the poor episcopalians, who are very numerous, but lost and obscured amidst the practical infidelity of those parts of that metropolis where the poor do chiefly congregate. On the 6th of December, the Church Society met in the Hopetoun Rooms, the bishop of Glasgow in the chair. The very rev. E. B. Ramsay read the report, being the fifth since the formation of this most useful and necessary society; wherein he gave a favourable view of its operations and success. Still, it is painful to think, that, with an abundant fund in their hands, they continue to keep the minimum of assistance at only £80; whereas, were they to let their "imprisoned angels" loose, there is abundance in the treasury to put them on an equality with the minimum of the established ministers, which is £150 per annum.

TRINITY CHURCH, Haddington, was formerly one of the independent chapels, and had never been consecrated. It was built in 1770, on a piece of ground that was given by the earl of Wemyss of that day. In the course of this year it had been completely renovated, the walls were heightened with a new cornice, and a handsome portico erected outside the door, and the interior was remodelled and renovated.

The bishop of Edinburgh, assisted by some of the diocesan clergy, consecrated this church on St. Thomas's day, the 21st of December.

1844.—ON EASTER MONDAY, the children belonging to the free episcopal school attached to St. Paul's, and superintended by its zealous incumbent, Mr. Alexander, were assembled to "a plain and simple entertainment" in the Bakers' Hall. There were 218 children present, which shews the rapid advance of church principles, and a large and fashionable company assembled to see what is rather a novel proceeding there. Bishop Terrott delivered an admirable and appropriate address to the children, in the course of which he reminded them that it was to the church that they were indebted for the exertions now made to rescue them from ignorance and vice, and for training them both for time and eternity. The dean exhorted them to regular attendance at church, to read their bibles, and to consider the Book of Common Prayer as the best practical commentary on the doctrines of revealed truth. In the spring of this year bishop Terrott confirmed nearly two hundred young persons belonging to the city of Edinburgh alone. The increase of confirmations annually, marks a decided and steady increase in the number of those who have been added to the church since the breaking up of the establishment.

A GROWING DESIRE had been for some time manifested by some of the inhabitants of Jedburgh and its neighbourhood, for the erection of a church in that town. The late marquis of Lothian, whose property, and one of his family mansions, are situate in the neighbourhood, purchased a parcel of ground called the "Croce acre," or the holy cross, and piously dedicated it to God, for the erection of a church, and a school to be connected therewith. Before he had completed what he intended, it pleased God to remove this worthy nobleman by death; but his widow and executors, with praiseworthy zeal, resolved to carry his pious intentions into effect. The dowager marchioness, therefore, laid the foundation stone, with the usual formalities, on the 14th of July, 1843. The work, says Mr. Teale, "thus originating in reverential love to God and man, proceeded without let or hindrance, and has been brought to a prosperous issue in the completion of a sanctuary which, both externally and internally, in design, arrangement, and minutest detail, bears witness to the spirit of liberal zeal, not less than the judicious regard to ecclesiastical propriety, in which the whole has been conceived, as also to the taste and skill which has directed the work in its execution."

This church is of the decorated style of christian architecture, and consists of a nave, chancel, porch, and vestry. On a raised platform, near the entrance of the church, is a handsome octagonal font of Caen stone. The nave is furnished with open benches, part of which are free for the poor. The prayers are offered from the choir-desk; the litany is said from a fald-stool, placed in the centre aisle before the chancel floor; the lessons are read from a bronzed eagle, standing near the south pier of the chancel arch; and the pulpit is situated on the north-east angle of the nave, which is paved with encaustic tiles. The altar is of Caen stone, and fixed to the wall; the front is pannelled with ornamental quatrefoils. A most worthy member of the congregation has endowed St. John's church with the interest of £1000, invested in government securities, and secured, by deed, to the incumbent for the time being, for ever¹.

THIS SPLENDID CHURCH was consecrated, by the bishop of the diocese, on the 15th of August, assisted by four bishops and about forty clergymen. The bishop of Glasgow, accompanied by the bishop of Aberdeen, the primus, the bishop of Moray, Ross, and Argyle, and by the bishop of Edinburgh, in their episcopal robes, and the clergy in their surplices, stoles, and hoods, walked in procession from the house of Mr. Laing to the church, where they were received in the porch by the marchioness of Lothian. The morning service was intoned by the rev. William Spranger White, the incumbent; and the Psalms and responses were chanted by the choir and the people. It is supposed that this is the first church in Scotland in which the choral service has been restored since the Revolution. The consecration sermon was preached by the rev. W. F. Hook, vicar of Leeds. The holy communion was administered to the clergy and a large body of the laity; and the offertory amounted to upwards of £100. After the consecration of the church and the communion, the burial-ground and vault beneath the chancel were consecrated in the usual form. Yet the presbyterian ministers beheld these portentous signs of the times as the Jews witnessed our Lord's miracles, and, like them, without there being any impression made on their hearts; being quite satisfied that the episcopal incumbents cannot run away with their stipends. On the afternoon of that day, archdeacon Wilberforce preached on the subject of the Christian Sacrifice. Dr. Hook again preached on Friday morning;

¹ Six Sermons, preached at the Consecration of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, &c.—Introduction, l.-xlii.

and on Sunday morning, Mr. Dodsworth, of Christ Church, St. Pancras, preached on Frequent Communion; and the communion was consecrated and administered by Dr. Hook. In the afternoon, the rev. John Keble, vicar of Horsley, preached on the subject, of “The Saints a Pattern for frequent Church Offices.” On the evening of the same day, the rev. Mr. Teale, vicar of Royston, concluded the services of this remarkable occasion, by an excellent sermon on “the Christian’s Obligation to glorify God in Body and Spirit.”

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE to reflect on the various and unprovoked acts of schism, disobedience, and revolt from lawful authority, that have been related in this chapter, without conviction that the “perilous times” predicted by the apostle have been realized in the Scottish branch of the catholic church, as well as in the establishment of that country. These ministers, late of the church, “be they who *separate* themselves, *sensual*, having *not* the spirit,” because they abode not in THE VINE; for no branch can bear fruit of itself, separate from the trunk, except it abide in the vine; no more can His ministers, unless they abide in Him. To such men as “neglect to bear the church,” our Saviour himself has commanded us to “let them be unto us as heathen men and publicans;” and an ancient prophet has recorded what the Lord had spoken:—“Thus saith the Lord God; every man of the house of Israel [that is, the church] that setteth up his idols in his heart, and putting the stumbling-block of his iniquity before his face, and cometh to a prophet, to inquire of him concerning me, I the Lord will answer him by myself: and I will set my face against that man, and will make him a sign and a proverb, and I will *cut him off* from the midst of my people¹.” St. Paul also has earnestly besought all christian men to “*mark* them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which” the christian church has taught; “and *avoid* them.” In another place the three apostles, Paul, Sylvanus, and Timothy, have added their command to St. Paul’s former entreaty to shun all communion with heathen men and publicans—that is, excommunicated persons. “Now *we command* you brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us. . . . And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, *note that man*, and have *no company with him*, that he may be ashamed¹.” But the Scotch schis-

¹ Ezekiel, xiv. 7, 8.

natics from the church, who have cut themselves off from the true vine, and the non-intrusionists, who have “disestablished” themselves, are so far from being ashamed of their disorderly walking, that they glory in their shame, and not only sin themselves, but use every method to draw others into their schism; and at the same time, with marvellous inconsistency, the former pray to be *delivered* from heresy and schism! The schismatics from the church, who had “prated against” their superiors “with malicious words,” were wholly actuated by the spirit of pride and self-will; so that one of these states that he chooses to act without episcopal control, *‘whensoever and wherever I please.’* Of the disruptionists, their historian Hetherington says, when describing their departure from the Assembly,—“Not one jarring incident occurred; no haste, no confusion, disturbed the great and grave solemnity of the *church of Scotland’s Exodus*; her friends were stilled from tumultuary applause, her enemies were restrained from wrathful violence, and the *presiding care of her Divine Head and King* rendered her path one of serenity and peace. . . . The whole scene was far beyond description—a scene such as, to share in and behold, might have amply rewarded the toils and sorrows of a lifetime—*a scene worth living to witness, worth dying to realize!*”

¹ Romans, 1.—1 Thess. i. 106.—ii. iii. 6, 14.

CHAPTER LXXXV.

PRIMACY OF THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM SKINNER, D.D.
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN,

AND

PRIMUS SCOTIÆ EPISCOPUS.

The apostolic succession.—Divine grace, how conveyed.—The Holy Spirit does not inspire two opposing parties.—The privilege of holding synods.—The bishop the pastor of his diocese.—The national communion office.—The English clergy in Scotland.—Trinity College, Perth—system of education—description of the building.—Dioceses of Glasgow—Edinburgh—St. Andrew, Dunkeld, and Dunblane—Brechin—Aberdeen—Moray, Ross, and Argyll.—Concluding remarks.

FROM WHAT HAS BEEN already said, it will be abundantly evident that episcopacy has never ceased to exist in Scotland from the first introduction of christianity, but more especially from the period at which this History commences; that is, the Reformation. When Knox commenced his assault upon the Roman church in Scotland, and left so many monuments of sacred ruins to attest his zeal and destructive propensities, the sees were all full. Some of the prelates were mere nominal bishops, that had never been consecrated, but were merely titulars, who usurped the place, and even the functions, of real bishops, defrauding the church and people of God of the benefit of episcopal supervision, and of those offices which bishops alone can perform. The real and titular Roman prelates were supplanted by titular protestant superintendents or bishops; but in the year 1588 king James restored archbishop James Beaton to his former see of Glasgow, and the illustrious Leslie still remained possessor of the see of Ross, although both of these prelates were resident abroad. Bishop Leslie died in 1597; but archbishop Beaton survived till 1603. Spottiswood and his brethren received valid consecration in 1610, so that there was only a vacancy of seven years between the episcopacy that had existed from the commencement of christianity and the Anglo-Saxon or reformed episcopacy, which succeeded Knox's superintendents, and titular bishops. All that race of bishops in the line of Spottiswood were literally *extirpated*,

one only of whom survived the cruel persecution under the Solemn League and Covenant to connect these episcopal lines with the present apostolic succession, in the line of the martyred archbishop Sharp.

THESE FACTS DECIDEDLY shew that God the Son had not forgotten his promise; but although he suffered the capital enemy of His church to succeed for a time in all but extirpating it, yet He still preserved a remnant to praise and glorify His name. Notwithstanding the existence of a persecution unparalleled in history, the Scottish prelates preserved the apostolic succession, without the slightest interruption, from its last introduction to the present chief pastor of that church, as it may be seen in the following catalogue of the episcopal succession, commencing with the Great Shepherd and Bishop of Souls, Jesus Christ, the ALPHA and the OMEGA. For God only can give a divine commission in the first instance. All, therefore, who want this divine commission, are really and truly usurpers of the sacerdotal office; and they only deceive the people whom they teach, for God is not bound to fulfil any of their engagements. And although they may plead their zealous and unwearied exertions in His service, yet it will be found that they were unauthorised, that they ran unsent, and that they *prevented* His commissioned servants from sacramentally feeding His people with the bread of life.

THE FIRST LINK of "the golden chain of succession," as Mr. Ramsay happily calls it, came down from heaven on the banks of the Jordan, when, says the apostolic Taylor, "the heavens were opened, and the air clarified by a new and glorious light, and the HOLY GHOST, in the manner of a dove, alighted upon His sacred head, and GOD THE FATHER gave a VOICE from heaven, saying, 'THOU art my beloved SON, in whom I am well pleased.' This was the inauguration and proclamation of the MESSIAS, when he began to be the great PROPHET of the new covenant. And this was the greatest meeting that ever was upon earth, when the whole cabinet of the mysterious TRINITY was opened and shewn, as much as the capacities of our present imperfections will permit; the SECOND PERSON in the veil of HUMANITY; the THIRD in the shape or with the motion of a dove; but THE FIRST kept His primitive state: and as to the Israelites, He gave notice by way of caution, 'Ye saw no shape, but ye heard a voice;' so now, also, God the Father gave testimony to His holy Son, and appeared only in a voice without any visible representment¹."

¹ Great Exemplar, sect. xi. 3.

Catalogue of the Apostolic Succession, from the commission to the Great Shepherd and Bishop of Souls, to the present bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus of the church of Scotland:—

A.D.	A.D.
30. JESUS CHRIST ¹ .	426. Honoratus.
35 ² . ST. PAUL ³ .	438. Hilarius.
60. Trophimus ⁴ .	449. Ravennius.
80. Dionysius.	468. Leontius.
85. Regulus.	493. Eonius.
106. Felicissimus.	502. Cæsarius.
120. Gratus.	542. Auxanius.
145. Ambrosius.	546. Aurelianus.
170. Martinus.	556. Sabandus.
180. Ingenuus.	589. Licerius.
230. Augustinus.	591. Etherius ⁶ .
220. Hieronymus.	597. Augustine ⁷ .
230. Savitius, or Savinus.	604. Lawrence.
245. Marcianus.	619. Mellitus.
258. Victor.	624. Justus.
270. Marinus ⁵ .	634. Honorius.
316. Martinus second.	654. Adeodatus ⁸ .
330. Nicasius.	vacant 4 years.
342. Valentinus.	668. Theodore, a Greek.
354. Saturninus.	693. BIRTHWALD, sat 37 years.
365. Crescentius.	731. Tatwine.
380. Concordius.	735. Nothelm.
392. Constantius.	742. Cuthbert.
410. Heros.	759. Bregwin.
422. Patroctus.	763. Lambrith, or Lambert.

¹ Luke iii. 21-23; Matthew iii. 16-17.

² According to the margin of the Bible.

³ Acts ix. 17-20; xxii. 12-17; 2 Cor. xii. 2-5.

⁴ A Greek; a native of Ephesus, Acts xxi. 29. St. Paul ordained him an apostle, and gave him charge of the church at Arles, in France.

⁵ This bishop presided at the first council of Arles, when three English bishops were present.

⁶ Venerable Bede says—"In the meantime the man of God, Augustine, repaired to Arles, and was, pursuant to the orders received from the holy father Gregory, ordained archbishop of the English nation, by Etherius, archbishop of that city. Then returning into Britain, he sent Laurentius the priest, and Peter the monk, to Rome, to acquaint pope Gregory that the nation of the English had received the faith of Christ, and that he was himself made their bishop.—Bede's Eccl. History, Book i. chap. xxvii. p. 45. . . . Thus far the answers of the holy pope Gregory to the questions of the most reverend prelate, Augustine. The Epistle he mentions he had writ to the bishop of Arles, was directed to Virgilius, successor to Etherius."—Bede's Eccl. History, Book i. chap. xxvii. pp. 60, 61. Dr. Giles' edition. London, 1840.

⁷ Archbishop of Canterbury.

⁸ The first Englishman that sat in this see.

. Athelard.	1366. Simon Langham, card.
. Wolfred.	and lord chan.
. Theolgild.	1368. William Wittlesey.
. Ceolnoth.	1375. Simon Sudbury, chan.
. Athelred.	1381. William Courtney.
. Plegmund.	1396. Thomas Arundel, chan.
. Athelm.	1414. Henry Chicheley, card.
. Wulfelm, lord chan.	1443. John Stafford, card.
Odo Severus.	chan. and treas.
Dunstan, lord treas.	1452. Joseph Kemp, chan.
Ethelgar.	1454. Thomas Bouchier,
Siricius.	card. and chan.
Elfric.	1486. John Morton, card. and
Elphege.	chan.
Leovingus.	1501. Henry Dean.
Agelnoth.	1503. William Warham, chan.
Edsine, or Eadsius.	1533. Thomas Cranmer, mart.
Robert Gemeticensis.	1555. Reginald Pole, card.
Stigand.	1559. Mathew Parker.
Lanfranc	1575. Edmund Grindall.
vacant 4 years.	1583. John Whitgift.
Anselm.	1604. Richard Bancroft.
Rodolphus, ch. justice.	1610. George Abbott.
William Corboyl.	1633. William Laud, mart.
Theobald.	vacant 16 years.
Thomas à Becket, chan.	1660. William Juxon ¹ .
Richard, a monk.	1661. Gilbert Sheldon, then
Baldwin.	bishop of London.
Reginald Fitzjocelin.	1661. James Sharp, archb. of
Hubert Walter, chan.	St. Andrews, & mart.
and chief justice.	1679. Alexander Burnet.
Stephen Langton, card.	1684. Arthur Ross.
Richard Wethershed.	1704. Alexander Rose, bishp.
Edmund	of Edinburgh, vicar
vacant 3 years.	gen. and metropolit.
Boniface of Savoy.	1720. John Fullarton.
Robert Kilwarby, card.	1727. Arthur Millar.
John Peckham.	1727. Andrew Lumsden.
Robert Winchelsea.	1733. David Freebairn, bi-
Walter Reynold, chan.	shop of Edinburgh,
Simon Mephram.	and primus Scotiæ
John Stratford, chan.	episcopus.
Thomas Bradwardine.	1739. Thomas Rattray, bishop
Simon Islippe.	of Dunkeld.

¹ the Rev. H. T. Powells' The Church of England, not the Church of the Catholic Church in England.—Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval's Apology.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1748. Robert Keith, bishop
of Edinburgh. | 1789. John Skinner, bishop
of Aberdeen. |
| 1757. Robert White, bishop
of Dunblane. | 1816. George Gleig, LL.D.
bishop of Brechin. |
| 1762. William Falconar, bi-
shop of Edinburgh. | 1837. James Walker, D.D.
bishop of Edinburgh. |
| 1782. Robert Kilgour, bishop
of Aberdeen. | 1841. William Skinner, D.D.
bishop of Aberdeen. |

IN THE ABOVE list of the apostolical succession we have a traditionary, or an historical, evidence of His faithfulness, who promised to be with the apostles “always,” reaching backwards from the present head of the Scottish church to the Lord of Glory himself, the only King and Head of His church. This succession was begun, and continued, by the “laying on of hands;” or, as Calvin says, “by hand to hand from the apostles.” All ecclesiastical authority, and all the graces by which the clergy are qualified, and enabled to perform the sacred functions of their different offices for the benefit of the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers, are entirely the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit. And He has no otherwise made them overseers, than by the imposition of the apostles’ hands, and of those of their successors in all succeeding ages; for they are not called *immediately* by the Holy Ghost, but *mediately* by the laying on of the hands of others. Bishops are consecrated by such human hands as have been duly authorised; and therefore they have been as really called by Him, and sanctified with His grace, as if they had received such an immediate authority as the eleven apostles did, or as miraculous an ordination as St. Paul. Agreeably, therefore, to the Scripture and to the primitive church, the consecrating bishop says to the person being consecrated, “Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: in the name, &c. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is given thee by this *imposition* of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of *power*, and love, and soberness.” The church, therefore, maintains, that the reception of the Holy Ghost is necessary to constitute a man a christian bishop or priest; and that He is conferred by the hands of a bishop. The bishops and clergy are employed in the same work in which Christ himself was occupied during his ministry on earth. He conveyed His authority to them, and promised that His Holy Spirit should remain with them, to enable them to continue that work till the end of the world. He promised them to bind or to loose, in heaven, whatsoever they should

bind or loose on earth; and He assured us, that whosoever shall despise, or attempt to *extirpate* them, despises and *persecutes* Him that sent Him.

BUT KNOX'S EPISCOPACY had no divine commission, but only that which Knox himself gave them, and contrary to the Scripture rule, and to the practice of the universal church, from the days of the apostles to his own time, he *discontinued* the divine and apostolic rite of the imposition of hands, as being unnecessary, in his judgment. The succession of bishops in the papal church in Scotland entirely ceased with archbishop Beaton, and no attempt was ever made to continue that line. The field of the church was therefore open, and unoccupied by any valid episcopacy, when archbishops Spottiswood and Sharp, and their colleagues, again laid the foundation of the national church. The line of succession through which the last of these two distinguished prelates received their sacred gifts and graces has never been broken, as may be seen in the above traditional evidence, which is, like christianity itself, and the canon of Scripture, *a matter of fact* conveyed to us by historical evidence. And it is morally impossible that the apostolic succession ever has been broken; because, says Mr. Law, "it has been a received doctrine in every age of the church, that *no ordination was valid but that of bishops*: This doctrine has been a constant guard upon the episcopal succession; for, seeing it was universally believed that bishops *alone* could ordain, it was *morally impossible* that any persons could be received as bishops who had not been so ordained¹." Although the presbyterians now admit ministers by the imposition of hands, yet it is an *innovation* in their system. Whilst acknowledging it to be an apostolic rite, as the papists declared the administration of the cup to be God's appointment, yet both parties *abrogated* divine institutions, and declared them to be *unnecessary*. And so recently as the year 1839, "the bishops and clergy at large of the church of England" are gravely informed by Dr. Bryce, that the imposition of hands is merely "proper and becoming," but "not necessary." "We are, therefore," he says, "bound to tell you, in all honesty, that at no period of our church's history has she looked upon *ordination* as conveying, through an apostolical channel, and chain of unbroken succession, the indelible character, graces, and influences, of which you hold it to be the divinely appointed vehicle." Let our christian brethren, the presbyterian people, therefore, consider well how they have been,

¹ Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, p. 102. Third edition. 1719.

and are, cheated by their ministerial teachers, who thus fairly acknowledge that which has been demonstrated in this history, that *they have no orders* whatever; that they cannot trace their descent even from John Knox, whom you venerate, far less to the apostles, as the reformed catholic church can do, which is the national witness for the truth. As the kirk possesses no divine charter, no holy orders, her ministers cannot convey to the people the gifts and graces of the gospel. For the sacred order of the clergy, and their divine commission, or call, is as necessary and as everlasting as the sacraments, and as unchangeable as the Holy Scriptures. The same Divine Person was as truly the author and founder of the apostleship and the priesthood as He was the institutor of the sacraments, or as he moved holy men of old to write the oracles of God. Although I have said that Divine grace is not officially conveyed through the presbyterian sacraments, yet I am far from saying, or even insinuating, that all Divine grace is withheld from ministers or people. For whatsoever good is in the heart, or whatsoever good thing the hand findeth to do, flows from the operation of Divine grace on the heart, and heartily agreeing with Mr. Cheyne, I beg to quote his words:—"I frankly acknowledge—indeed it would be utter blindness to the influence of Divine grace, not to acknowledge—the many instances of personal excellence, the high degrees of moral goodness, which have grown up under the teaching of the religious establishment of the country, enough to fill us with the deepest humiliation at the thought of our own shortcomings¹." And notwithstanding the superior and most inestimable advantages which those of the household of faith enjoy, but seem to undervalue, we may hereafter see many come from the east and from the west, to sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; when the children of the kingdom by adoption and grace, shall be cast into outer darkness, when the Chief Bishop shall come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

IN THE CASE OF SCHISMS in the church itself, or in the case of an opposite and contradictory communion, vowing to extirpate the church, it must be self-evident that the Holy Spirit cannot inspire both the parties. Whichever is the true church has the SPIRIT OF GOD dwelling in its ministers and members; and common sense, even, independent of Scripture authority, would demonstrate that the true church would be known by its fruit. The fruit of the Spirit is eminently exhibited in the re-

¹ Holiness the True Reforming Power of the Church. A sermon, note, p. 25.

formed catholic church of the three kingdoms. But the popish schismatics, and the presbyterian dissenters of all sorts, have abundantly produced the works of the flesh which lusteth *against* the Spirit; among these are, "*idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strifes, seditions, and heresies.*" Communion producing fruit lusting against the Spirit of God cannot be part of the "one catholic and apostolic church," in which we profess our belief, and of which Christ is the Head, and each member the temple of the Holy Ghost, under whose Divine influence all the members of Christ's family are united, like the stones of a material building, so as to become the temple and habitation of God. Its whole history, and some of its formularies, shew that the presbyterians and the papists *hate* the reformed episcopal church, one of whom is sworn to "*extirpate*," and the other is sworn to "*persecute and oppose*" it; but let the church be of good cheer, "if the world HATE you [said Christ to the *little* flock which then composed the whole church], ye know that it HATED ME *before it hated you.*" Although the servant is not greater than his Lord, yet he *represents* his Lord in all points. As the world persecuted Him, so it has persecuted His representatives, the bishops and priests of the reformed Catholic church of Scotland, as it has been demonstrated in this history of their sufferings. It still continues to hate and speak evil of them, and of the faith whereof they have had the high privilege to bear witness in their eucharistic service. But every branch of the holy Catholic church that beareth the fruit of the Spirit, is purged, that it may bring forth more perfect fruit; for as many as God loves He rebukes and chastens. The Scottish branch of the vine experienced neglect, even scorn, from her sister churches, in the days of her calamity, and *hatred, emulation, and wrath*, from the people that had gone out from her, but who, in heart, could never have been truly of her. They proved themselves unworthy of the sacred deposit of the apostolic succession, of which Christ himself was the first link, and will be the last—the Alpha and the Omega. They have shewn a greater degree of ferocity against the representatives of Christ—that is, against Christ himself—than even the Jewish husbandmen did towards the Householder that planted their vineyard, and hedged it round about, for they "beat one, and killed another, and stoned another."

IT CANNOT BE EXPECTED that those without the church can see and understand the advantages and privileges which the Scottish church enjoys; but even those of her own household do not appreciate her claims upon their affection and reve-

rence. She enjoys that from which the united church of England and Ireland is inexorably debarred by the tyranny of the state—the power of meeting in synods and convocations. In Scotland, every bishop holds a synod, consisting of his dean and all the incumbents of churches within his diocese, wherein every incumbent lays before the synod a report of the state of his congregation, containing the number of souls and communicants in it, of baptisms, marriages, and deaths, of persons catechised and confirmed, of communicants at the several festivals and other communions, a list of the stranger clergymen who have preached in his church within the year, and such other particulars as the bishop shall prescribe. Every diocesan synod may also suggest rules for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs, which, if approved by the bishop, and not inconsistent with the constitution and canons of the church, have the force of laws within that diocese¹. Besides diocesan synods, upon the occurrence of important business, the whole bishops can meet in a general synod, sitting in one chamber, be assisted by the deans and one delegate, or proctor of the clergy of each diocese, with their prolocutor sitting in another chamber. These synods are called at any time that the exigencies of their own church may require, by the determination of a numerical majority of the bishops, and can enact or repeal canons or rules for the order and discipline of the church, without consulting the secretary of state, or of being controled by the queen's representative, or of being dissolved at his pleasure². Moreover, an episcopal synod, consisting of the bishops alone, is held every year, which receives appeals from either the clergy or the laity against their own immediate ecclesiastical superior³. These are privileges which the united church of England and Ireland sigh after, but do not enjoy.

SINCE THE REVOLUTION, the calamities of the church have prevented the bishops from residing within their own dioceses, but it is to be hoped that the prosperity which the church now enjoys, may, for the time to come, remove that inconvenience. The bishops are the ambassadors and the representatives of Christ; consequently their dignity is supereminent. The government of both the clergy and the laity is committed to them. Each bishop, therefore, is the PASTOR of the flock of Christ, and also of the shepherds of that flock—that is, of both the clergy and the laity; and they are bound, not only to bring strangers and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,

¹ Canon xxxi. p. 36.

² Ibid. xxxii. pp. 37, 38.

³ Ibid. xxxiv. p. 39.

within the pale of the church, but to oversee their christian conduct therein. It is but too much the custom to consider the chief pastor of the diocese as merely a superior clergyman, who ordains and institutes the parochial clergy, and who confirms the young; and this wrong impression is fostered in the minds of the people by the reserve of the bishops themselves. At visitations of their dioceses, the bishops appear only to act for and with their clergy, entirely omitting all notice or intercourse with the laity, who are as much the objects of their pastoral care as the clergy. Their charges are exclusively addressed to the clergy; whereas, were they to include the duties and the morals of the laity, it would produce and nourish a greater degree of reverence for the episcopal office, and of affectionate regard for the sacred persons of the bishops. By this intercourse, and by occasional pastoral letters addressed to the laity of their dioceses, a greater degree of subordination would be gradually induced on the minds of the people, and a more salutary and better obeyed discipline be exercised by the bishops themselves. One pastoral letter was issued by the late primate, bishop Walker, and, had it been continued, it might have cemented the affections of the people so effectually to their governors, as to have prevented such enormous wickedness as has been perpetrated by such vain-glorious clergymen as have recently revolted, and set up separate conventicles. The time is now gone past when persecution obliged the fathers of the church to court seclusion and obscurity; sober publicity would be more consistent, that the presbyterians may see their good works, and glorify God by embracing the truth and joining themselves to the church. Sure enough, the presbyterians cannot bear the whole truth, were it to be set before them, having lived so long in an atmosphere of excitement, and, like the Athenians, spending their time in nothing else but either to preach or to hear some new preacher. But these pastoral letters might, in process of time, be seen and read by those without the church, as well as by those to whom they are especially directed; and, by divine grace operating on ingenuous minds, they might be won by the holy conversation and the earnest entreaties of the fathers of the church. The charmer would not always address himself to deaf adders; for let us hope and earnestly pray that the divine controversy with that guilty nation is drawing to a close, and that He will inspire earnest-minded presbyterians to eschew heresy and schism—to seek peace and to ensue it.

IN HER EUCHARISTIC service, the reformed catholic church of Scotland possesses a treasure and a witness for the truth,

of which it is most deplorable to see that many of her sons are insensible. Even in this solemn part of divine worship, where she adheres to apostolic doctrine and to primitive practice, the besetting sin of the age—the fear of the people—has created a morbid excitement to throw away their inestimable jewel. Upon such men it may be said that God has not sent the spirit of martyrdom, but of fear and of unfaithfulness. Mr. Cheyne admits “that there does seem to have been, on the part of our clergy and people at large, *a strange insensibility* to the great privilege of possessing an eucharistic service so conformable to the primitive liturgies.” It is also conformable to the doctrine of the church of England; yet, in method, Mr. Wheatley confesses that the Scottish is *more primitive* than the English¹. According to the primitive method, the Scottish office has a prayer of oblation and invocation, by which the elements of bread and wine are offered to God, as the memorial of Christ’s sacrifice; after which, the blessing of the Holy Spirit is solemnly invoked upon them, when they become our Lord’s Body and Blood. Till the impertinent interference of some of the foreign divines that had puffed themselves up into a great name, the English office also contained a prayer of oblation and invocation. Mr. Wheatley complains that this prayer was mangled and displaced, and that the liturgy suffered “*a material alteration*.” “The prayer of oblation,” he says, “which, by the first book of king Edward, was ordered to be used after the prayer of consecration (and which has since been restored to the Scotch Common Prayer), being *half laid aside*, and the rest of it thrown into an *improper place*, as being enjoined to be said by our present rubrick, in that part of the office which is to be used after the people have communicated; whereas it was *always the practice* of the primitive christians to use it during the act of consecration. For the holy eucharist was, from the very first institution, esteemed and received as *a proper sacrifice*, and *solemnly offered* to God upon the altar, before it was received and partaken of by the communicants. In conformity whereunto, it was bishop Overall’s practice to use the *first* prayer in the post-communion office *between* the consecration and the administering, even when it was otherwise ordered by the public liturgy².”

IN BOTH THE ENGLISH and the Scottish liturgy, the bread and the wine *after* consecration are called the Body and the Blood of our Lord and Redeemer, the true Paschal Lamb;

¹ Rational Illustration, p. 276, 8th edit.

² Ibid. 280, 281.

in both, it is declared to be a commemorative sacrifice ; in the one it is only more solemnly offered up than in the other, but till it is offered up, in both offices, on the altar, and afterwards the people are fed by both from the table of the Lord, with the memorials of the heavenly feast. Nevertheless, several priests unfaithfully declined to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the apostles and primitive christians, one of whom, more the shame, was taught at the feet of bishop Ridley ; and some others, who erred from ignorance, not only of the Scripture, but of the doctrine and former practice of the church of England, agreed to discard the national eucharistic office as “an old almanack.” Heaven grant that this unfaithfulness may not be called a denial of Christ before men, a burying of their talent in the earth, a being ashamed of the cross ! But if men can make changes in the summary way that the dean and synod of Moray, &c. discarded the national office, and profanely despised their birthright, what security have we that the English national office shall meet with more respect, when it pleases any unfaithful priests or people to get up an agitation against it ? We never know where innovation is to stop ; it is like the letting out of water, the longer it runs, the broader, the more rapid, and the more destructive it becomes. Those unfaithful clergy within the church in the northern dioceses may be said to have stricken hands with the excommunicated men who first began the impious agitation against the national eucharistic service ; and they are therefore partakers in their sin. It is well known, says Mr. Cheyne, that the movement against our Scottish liturgy originated with a schismatical [and *ipso facto* excommunicated] presbyter in Edinburgh [Drummond], who sought, in the late discovered objections to it, a justification of his dreadful sin ; he was quickly followed by another miserably self-willed individual of the clergy [Dunbar, who has been authoritatively excommunicated], who shewed how well he had profited from the lessons of his teacher, by turning his back upon the sacred mysteries, on the most solemn and interesting occasion. These unhappy persons were joined by a third [Craig], who had likewise been solemnly pledged ‘in all things to promote the peace, unity, and order’ of the church, but who seemed on this occasion *eager* rather to *fan the flame of discord* which another had kindled.” This “flame of discord” was kept up by other parties, who shewed their impious disregard of the church’s authority, by preaching for the excommunicated baronet of Aberdeen in his conventicle, even whilst they were at the same time affecting to yield obedience, the

one to the bishop of Glasgow, and the other to the bishop of Moray. The former of these, Mr. Miles, has been formally excommunicated by the bishop of Glasgow, after the endurance of much impertinent correspondence, and of the most contemptible ignorance.

THESE SCHISMS AND DIVISIONS are most deplorable, but they are not surprising. The schismatics are all priests of the church of England, who, either from their incapacity, turbulence, and self-willedness, or from other causes, cannot procure employment as stipendiary curates from the catholic-minded clergy in England; but who seek their way into Scotland, and, by popular preaching and uncatholic doctrines, secure all the richer benefices in that country. These collect congregations out of all the denominations by which that unhappy country is afflicted, and enjoy better and richer livings there than many a vicar or rector in the church of England. These men seize and appropriate to themselves the *birthrights* of the native clergy, most of whom are left to pine in hopeless poverty and neglect; so much so, that it became necessary to institute the Church Society in order to relieve their most urgent necessities, thirty-four of whom required its assistance, to raise their incomes to the paltry sum of eighty pounds. Schism and division, therefore, come on that church as a punishment for thus discountenancing native merit, and encouraging uncatholic-minded men who are rejected at home. These heresies, quarrels, factions, and separations, only make the faithful clergy, both of native and of English ordination, the more "approved," their righteousness the more "manifest," and their piety and virtue to shine the brighter. The unnatural evil of promoting strangers, lies almost altogether with the laity, who "will have it so;" especially managers and vestrymen, who speculate on having well-filled churches, high pew-rents, and large weekly collections. All the calamities which have befallen that church have originated with men who have thus been brought into it; and native priests, however eminent for talents or distinguished for piety, might "as easily pull a star out of the firmament" as procure an appointment in the capital cities.

THE ESTABLISHMENT of Trinity College, Perth, is perhaps one of the most extraordinary events of the period. Formerly young men intending to take holy orders had to attend the ordinary curriculum of the presbyterian colleges, and then study under the instruction and oversight of the bishop who was to ordain them. Since the establishment of the Pantonian professorship and the Bell Lectures in ecclesiastical history,

divinity students have been regularly instructed by these two professors after having taken their degree of M.A. in one of the established universities, which requires a course of four years. At present the course of study is regulated by the sixth canon, enjoining the studies and qualifications of candidates for holy orders":—"In the canons intended for the church of Scotland, and sanctioned by royal authority, for the year 1635, the second chapter, entitled, 'of presbyters and deacons, their nomination, ordination, function, and charge,' is thus very properly introduced—'Forasmuch as the weight of the ministerial calling doth require such a measure of sufficiency as human weakness can attain unto, and is often discredited by the ignorance, insufficiency, and scandalous conversation of many who undertake the same; it is ordained, that no person hereafter shall be admitted to that holy function who hath not been bred in some university or college, and hath taken some degree there, and who shall verify the same by the subscriptions and seals of the university or college where he received the degree of learning.' In conformity with the spirit of this extract, it is hereby decreed that no person be received as a candidate for holy orders in this church who shall not have first gone through a regular academical course in some university or college. It is, moreover, expressly ordered, that no person shall be admitted into the holy order of deacons in this church, until he shall have been properly examined as to his literature by two or more presbyters appointed for that purpose by the bishop who is to ordain him, and whom, as his examiners, he must satisfy of his being sufficiently acquainted with the whole of the New Testament in the original Greek, and at whose bidding he must compose a short treatise in Latin on some article of faith, as also a discourse in English on any text of Scripture which they shall prescribe; and answer such questions connected with theology and ecclesiastical history as they shall think proper to put to him; and before his admission to examination, the bishop must, by sufficient letters testimonials, and by an attestation that the form, usually called *Si Quis*, has been publicly read, be satisfied of his good life and conversation, as well as his good learning. It is also required that he produce a certificate of his having attended at least one course of lectures of the Bantonian professor of theology, and of our professor of ecclesiastical history in Edinburgh; unless peculiar circumstances in his case may have rendered such attendance impracticable, of which the ordaining bishop is to be the sole judge. And

no one shall be promoted to the order of priest until he shall have passed a still more full and complete examination."

IT IS PROBABLE that the two professorships mentioned above will be incorporated with Trinity College; and some alteration in the above canon may become necessary to suit it to existing circumstances. In Trinity College it is intended to combine general education with domestic discipline, and a systematic religious superintendence. It is also proposed to receive and board about 200 youths from eight to eighteen years of age; and to afford a sound clerical education to young men destined for holy orders. There will be exhibitions or bursaries for boys that intend to become divinity students. The whole establishment will be placed under a warden, who will be a clergyman of high reputation and attainments, with professors and teachers in classical literature, mathematics, and those branches of mental and natural philosophy usually comprehended in academical courses. All donors of £100, provided they be members of the reformed catholic churches of Scotland, or of England and Ireland, are entitled to a voice in conjunction with the bishops and the members of the committee in settling of the permanent constitution of the establishment. The right of nominations may be purchased, as follows:—One for one hundred guineas, two for two hundred, three for three hundred, and five for a thousand guineas. Nominated pupils will have a deduction of ten per cent. from the current rate of annual payment for board and education. So anxious were the citizens of Perth to have Trinity College erected in the immediate neighbourhood of their town, that the provost and corporation voted £500, or an equivalent in value. This handsome offer was, I believe, declined. The town council of Edinburgh also proposed to incorporate the new college with the University of Edinburgh; but on the condition of securing the administration of the money subscribed, and the patronage to the corporation of Edinburgh. This proposal was, of course, declined.

THE AMOUNT SUBSCRIBED for Trinity College is upwards of £21,000; and although it will require a sum of £32,000 to complete the building and the other objects of the institution, yet the committee of management thought themselves warranted in commencing the building. It is gratifying to observe from a print of the proposed building—"that the architectural features of the place will most admirably harmonise with its high purpose—the training and sending forth men to proclaim the TRUTH in a land where man has done his

it to cast it out ; and the providing a first-rate education for members of the church generally." The following description of the building is anonymous ; but it has received approbation of the architect, John Henderson, Esq., as giving a correct delineation of his plan :—"The whole mass the building will enclose a quadrangle, duly furnished with cloisters ; on the south side (taking the chapel to stand, as is usual, east and west) are cloisters only ; presenting externally a blank and buttressed wall, with a gateway in the centre. On the east extends a range of most picturesque building, exquisitely finished in details, and mediæval in character—with a main entrance, and admirable gateway tower :—buildings of similar subordinate character form the north side of the quadrangle. On the east are the hall and library ; the former, as the design seems to indicate, surmounted by a louvre. At the north-eastern angle, and almost external to the general arrangement, stands the chapel, a beautiful building, with a fine tower and spire at the north-western angle, and in a line with the southern range of cloisters, and on the north with the library. The whole is strikingly beautiful—one of the most beautiful things we have seen among the instances of revived piety and feeling. The chapel, library, and hall, are early English in design ; but with excellent judgment the architect designed the rest of the building in a later and more domestic style—yet quite collegiate in its whole aspect. Most ardently do we wish 'God speed' to this noble undertaking of an established and unendowed church ; nor can we believe that any appeal can be made in vain to those who love and value religious truth in connection with apostolic order,' made by the poorer members of the church. The buildings, which will be, when completed, so beautiful, are now in progress ; and would be lamentable and disgraceful if want of funds were to mar this noble plan¹."

THE REFORMED CATHOLIC CHURCH OF SCOTLAND is now daily increasing, but especially in that district of it which has hitherto been the hotbed of presbyterianism. Since the writer remembers, there were only five congregations, three of which were independents, in all that extensive district, which comprehends the ancient bishopricks of Glasgow, founded by Saint Mungo, and of Galloway, founded by Saint Ninian at Candida Casa, or white house, now in ruins. Venerable Bede says, "the southern Picts, who dwell on this side of the mountains, had long before [the arrival of St. Columba]

¹ Hampshire Advertiser.

as is reported, forsaken the errors of idolatry and embraced the truth by the preaching of Nynias, a most reverend bishop and holy man of the British nation, who had been regularly instructed at Rome in the faith and mysteries of the truth; whose episcopal see, named after St. Martin the bishop, and famous for a stately church (wherein he and many other saints rest in the body) is still in existence among the English nation. The place belongs to the province of the Bernicians, and is generally called *Candida Casa*, the white house¹, because he there built a church of stone, which was not usual among the Britons². This district, therefore, was the first in which the light of the blessed gospel was preached in Scotland by a sainted bishop; and in this district bishops were first proscribed, excommunicated, and threatened with death, and the presbyterian kirk has never had the charity, no, nor even the spurious liberality of modern times, to remove their malediction. How, therefore, can they expect their prayers to be heard, and their sins to be forgiven, when the *condition* of the forgiveness of sins is so notoriously violated?³ Throughout that whole district presbyterianism shewed its unmitigated natural ferocity, and all the natural works of the flesh, as they had been ingrained by its original instructors, the jesuits. Now, by official information before me, there are seventeen churches in this diocese, but, alas! in only one of them is the national eucharistic office used. Properly speaking, however, there are only sixteen churches in it, because St. James's Church, Leith, is a peculiar attached to this diocese for the time being. 1. St. Mary's, which, although not first in point of time, I have first named, because its congregation was the original national church mentioned before as having worshipped in an apartment of the Grammar School. At the death of the Rev. A. Jamieson, this church was built for that congregation and the accessions which had been made to it. The new incumbent unceremoniously discarded the national liturgy and adopted the English office. 2. St. Andrew's was originally an independent meeting that came into the obedience of the church about the commencement of bishop Sandford's episcopate. 3. Christ Church, was projected and partly built; but the congregation was altogether gathered by the Rev. David Aitchison about the year 1834.

ST. JUDE'S MEETING-HOUSE cannot now be reckoned among the diocesan churches. That congregation was collected out

¹ The stone of that county is a beautiful white granite.—Personal observation.

² Bede's Ecclesiastical History, iii. chap. iv. p. 130, 131. Giles's Edit. 1840.

³ St. Matth. vi. 12, 14, 15.

of all the sects, by the Rev. Robert Montgomery, on whose removal it was filled by one of those shooting stars that are in Scotland, vulgarly, but most emphatically, denominated "*land-loupers*." This man fraternised with heathen men and publicans, and after a great deal of correspondence with the most patient and meek bishop of that diocese, he was most justly excommunicated, and his name appears in the almanack among the fraternity of independents. About £3000 was collected, by subscription, for the erection of St. Jude's, including £100 from the Christian Knowledge Society. Too much reliance, however, was placed on the honour and honesty of those who had undertaken the management of the temporalities of the congregation, and they incurred a debt of about £4,000, only £500 of which has been since paid off, and for which they are personally responsible. In order to protect themselves they procured the title deeds to be made out in their own names, so that the building belongs to them. Were it not so heavily burthened, it might be recovered by process of law; but in the meantime these managers have all entered heartily into their minister's heresy, and of course they have withdrawn both the congregation, and the edifice itself, from the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese.

4. THE CONGREGATION of St. John's church, at Annan, was collected in 1841.—5. that of Trinity church, Ayr, in 1832, and they met in a public hall, till 1839, when the church was built and consecrated.—6. In 1843, St. John's, Coatbridge, near Airdrie, was built and consecrated, as already noticed.—7. St. Mary's, Dumfries, was originally an independent meeting.—8. St. John's church, Greenock, was built for a congregation that had been formed about twenty years ago, and then met in a hired apartment.—10. The congregation in the town of Hamilton at present meet in a large room; it was formed in 1842, and the present incumbent sometimes preaches in his surplice.—11. The congregation of Trinity church, Helensburgh, was formed in 1841; and during the life of the first incumbent the offertory was collected, the sentences were read, and the prayer for the church militant was used; but in consequence of the present incumbent being only in deacons' orders, these pious and good offices, used in obedience to the rubric, have been discontinued. When he has "purchased to himself a good degree," and has been advanced to the priesthood, it is devoutly to be hoped that he will walk in the steps of his predecessor, in obedience to the rubric, and restore these offices.—12. The consecration of St. John's church, Jedburgh, has been already described; it was built, and the

congregation was formed, in 1844. This is the only church in the diocese of Glasgow in which the national communion-office is used. In this church the service is performed daily, the holy communion is administered every Sunday, and, of course, the offertory is collected, and the prayer for the church militant is read.—13. St. Andrew's church, Kelso, was originally independent, but the rev. Mr. Kell conformed about the year 1825.—14. Trinity Church, Paisley, was built in the year 1833, but the rev. W. M. Wade, now the dean of the diocese, collected the congregation in 1817.—15. The congregation in Peebles was formed about the year 1828, and the church was built in 1836.—16. A congregation is forming in the beautiful town of Melrose, celebrated for the ruins of its Abbey; and considerable progress has been made in procuring funds for the erection of a church¹.—17. St. James's Church, Leith, is at present attached to the diocese of Glasgow, because bishop Russell has been for many years incumbent of it. There was, at one time, an intention to collect a congregation at Maybole, near Ayr; and there are a number of episcopalians in the market-town of Newton-Stewart, in Galloway, where a congregation might be formed, were there a resident clergyman appointed. In these two, and in all similar cases, the Church Fund is invaluable, by affording a small living to a clergyman until a new congregation can organise the means of contributing to his support.

IN THE DIOCESE OF EDINBURGH there are twelve churches, six of which are in that city. The English communion office is used in all of them, and the Morning and Evening Service is commenced by singing a portion of a Psalm or Hymn. In one church only, St. Paul's, Carrubbers Close, is the communion administered weekly. Another church has been projected for the exclusive accommodation of the poor, in which I hope the national office will be adopted. The bishop, Dr. Terrott, is resident within his diocese; and in all the churches, the communion by the English office is administered on the first Sunday of each month, on which occasion no sermon is delivered. The Athanasian Creed is read on the appointed days. In the churches of Stirling and Alloa, the national communion office has been disused; a circumstance that is much to be lamented. A new church has been erected at Stirling in the course of last year, and there having been a bell on the old one, it has been put up in the new, and is rung regularly before Morning and Evening Services, and on

¹ Private Communication.—Aberdeen Almanack.

the holidays of the church. There is a bell also attached to St. Paul's Church, Edinburgh, which is rung on Sundays only, previous to Morning and Evening Prayers; but, from that morbid fear of giving offence to the presbyterians, it is not rung on the weekly fasts or feasts of the church. Since the foregoing was printed, I have received the refreshing intelligence, although not from the worthy and respected incumbent himself, that the national communion office has been successfully re-introduced into the church of St. Pauls, Carrubbers Close, at the *early* matins, the number of communicants being already from fifty to sixty at that celebration¹. This shews that might be done by the clergy, had they first a *willing mind*; but the misfortune is, that *fashion* and *popularity* are more attended to than plain duty and the love of God. The *order* only is a little different in the national from the English service; the words are precisely the same in both; and in a large communion, and where there is only one priest, the benedictions are shorter, and not so exhausting to the administrator's strength as in the English office.

IN THE UNITED DIOCESES of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, there are fifteen churches, and one more that is a peculiar, at present attached to the dioceses of Moray, Ross, and Argyle. There is also a temporary place of worship in the ancient city of Dunkeld. Three of these churches, however, are under the charge of the very rev. John Torry, the dean of the diocese. Five entirely new congregations have been formed since bishop Torry has presided over that district; and, in four of them, elegant church-like edifices have been erected; whilst several of the old congregations have rebuilt their churches. The church in Forfar contains 370 sittings, but the priest has no fixed stipend. This church, however, is not vested officially in the bishop of the diocese and his successors, as stated by Mr. Lawson, in the Appendix to his work; "but in a certain number of trustees, of whom the present incumbent [the rev. William Taylor] is one." In five only of these churches the national communion office is used,—namely, Alyth, Forfar, Kirriemuir, Meigle, and Muthill. In some of the churches of these dioceses the service is commenced with singing; in some churches private collections of hymns are used, and in others the authorised version of the psalms. "In none of our charges is the Athanasian Creed—at bulwark of orthodoxy—ever read, nor the offertory; the

¹ Private Communications.—Author's Own Recollections.—Aberdeen Almanac.

prayer for the church militant rarely, in some places never, except when the holy communion is administered. But in no chapel in this diocese, so far as I am aware, does any clergyman use extemporary prayer, though preaching without a paper, is, unhappily, not *altogether* unknown among us¹."

IN THE DIOCESE OF BRECHIN there are ten charges; one of which, at Caterline, a fishing village, has been added a few years ago. The Rev. James Stevenson, the incumbent, has commenced a subscription for building a church, for the accommodation of his interesting flock, at this place. No new churches have been built in this diocese within the last ten years; "although, in a few cases, considerable additions have been made—as to the chapels at Arbroath, Muchals, and Dundee." John Gladstone, Esq. is erecting a church and parsonage at Fasque, near his own residence; and he is also to endow the living according to the spirit of the gospel and his own benevolent disposition. When completed, this will make eleven charges in this diocese; and may it please God to grant, that the same Holy Spirit that influenced the mind of Mr. Gladstone to do this good work, will also put it into his heart to establish the use of the national communion-office in the church which he is erecting! St. Catherine's church, Blair-Gowrie, is at present vacant. At Montrose, in this diocese, there is one of those independent meeting-houses which absurdly call themselves "English episcopal." Some influential families attending this meeting-house proposed their union with the church; but it was opposed by the numerical strength of the congregation, and therefore they still remain in solitary independency. Those, however, whom God had influenced to come out of their heresy and schism, and to be no longer partakers in it, have determined to erect a large and handsome edifice, in the obedience of the church, which is to be a collegiate charge during the life of the Rev. Patrick Cushnie, the Catholic incumbent of a large room fitted up as a chapel, in which he has officiated for many years. It is pleasing to record the munificent oblation of D. Scott, Esq., of Brotherton, who has subscribed £1000 towards its erection; and it is to be hoped that others, on a smaller scale, will follow his blessed example. It is most devoutly to be hoped, that the national communion-office will be used in the new church when it is erected, as it has always been hitherto in the small chapel of Montrose². Not very long ago there

¹ Scottish Episcopal Times—Private Communications—Aberdeen Almanack.

² Alas! Since the foregoing was in print, I have been informed, that Mr.

were seven altars at which the national communion-office was used, and three where the English ritual was employed; but I regret to say, that there are now only five congregations in which that Catholic office is used. In the church at Drumlithie, the incumbent keeps to the letter of the rubric, in every thing except in reading the sentences whilst the weekly collection or free-will offering is being gathered up. At Muchalls, the clergyman preaches in his surplice, and the service is commenced by singing a verse of a Psalm instead of a voluntary, whilst the priest walks from the vestry to the desk. The Athanasian Creed is read at Muchalls only on Trinity Sunday; and the prayer for the church militant is read occasionally, but not regularly. This is one of the five churches in which the national office is used. It is also still used in the church at Stonehaven; but the clergyman, who was formerly a presbyterian, has directed the clerk and congregation, when reading or singing the *Benedicite*, to omit the stanza,—“O ye spirits and souls of the righteous, bless ye the Lord; praise Him and magnify Him for ever¹.” This is practically to deny that article of the Creed—the descent into hell. Now it may be worthy of consideration, whether or not, if one word in St. James’s epistle were altered, the sense of that verse might not apply with full force to this and similar cases:—“For whosoever shall keep the whole *faith*, and yet offend in *one* point, he is guilty of all.”

IN THE DIOCESE of Aberdeen there are twenty-one charges; in eighteen of these the national communion-office is used; and in three, namely, St. John’s, Aberdeen; St. Mary’s, Inverury, and at Old Deer, the English office is adopted². In the great majority of the churches in this diocese the service commences with singing one or more verses of a psalm. There are only five churches in which the creed of St. Athanasius is read on all the appointed days; namely, St. John’s, Aber-

Cushnie, an ancient priest of the national church, unhappily changed on Easter-day from the national to the English communion service, in order to propitiate the few individuals who have left the independents of that town, and have put themselves under that gentleman’s superintendence.

¹ Private Communications—The Scottish Episcopal Times, March 23, 1846—Aberdeen Almanack.

² In the following congregations the national Eucharistic-office is used:—St. Andrew’s cathedral, Aberdeen; St. Andrew’s church, Banff; St. James’, Cruden; St. Luke’s, Cumminstown; St. Peter’s, Frasersburgh; St. John’s, New Pitsligo; St. Matthew’s, Old Meldrum; St. Peter’s, Peterhead; St. John the Baptist, Portsoy; Holy Trinity, Turriff; and at the following *unconsecrated* churches:—Ellon, Forgue, Longside, Lonmay, Micklefolla, Monymusk, Wordhead.

been, St. James's, Cruden, St. John's, New Pitsligo, Ellon, and Forgue, the two last of which are not consecrated. It is read in St. Peter's, Frasersburgh, on Christmas-day; and on the Sundays and high festivals at Old Deer, and Lonmay, as the lesser feasts are not generally observed in these two churches. It is never read in the other churches of this diocese, although it is a bulwark of the faith. There is a custom in one of the churches of changing the proper lessons on communion Sundays, and in the course of the year, it is said, the changes may amount to about fifty. In some congregations in this diocese "long presbyterian-looking prayers" are used before and after the general thanksgiving, at the festivals, on communion days, and at the new year. At one time these were universal in this diocese; but they have been disused at Cruden, New Pitsligo, Old Deer, St. John's, Aberdeen, St. Peter's, Frasersburgh, St. Mary's, Inverary, and St. Peter's, Peterhead. At one of the churches, an extempore, or at least not the liturgical, exhortation, on the Sunday before the communion, has been used from time immemorial; and the incumbent uses a private, unwritten form of baptism of his own, or perhaps his predecessor's composition. Till within a few years, with the exception of St. John's, Aberdeen, the communicants were dismissed from the altar rails in sets or by tables in the presbyterian fashion. At which time an address, in some instances composed of a single sentence, in others pretty long, and in a few simply a benediction,—“go, or depart in peace, and the God of peace be with you,” was delivered to each detachment, and a verse of a psalm or hymn was sung as the communicants retired in a body from the altar rails. But this practice, which has no authority from the rubric of either the national or of the English office, is gradually wearing out, and a strict adherence to the words and rubrics of the office is being generally introduced. “There are, however, unmistakeable signs of a ‘pulling up’ among the clergy; and in a few years, I would fain hope, there will be substantial conformity and uniformity. Indeed, the great hindrances are the congregations, who have got so wedded to these presbyterian customs, that the conscientious pastor has often great difficulty in purifying the worship.” “The grumbling in those congregations was very great when their clergymen dispensed with dismissing the communicants from the altar rails with the address and the singing. The clergy, with very few exceptions, are prudently endeavouring to indoctrinate their flocks with the wholesome watchword—‘the Prayer-Book, the whole

Prayer-Book, and nothing but the Prayer-Book ;' and, with God's help, their efforts must eventually be successful¹."

WHEN THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. LOW succeeded to the diocese of Ross and Argyle, there were only four clergymen in it; and at the death of bishop Jolly, when the diocese of Moray was annexed to it, there were only four clergymen in that diocese. Now, in the three dioceses, including the bishop's own peculiar at Pittenweem, in the diocese of St. Andrews, there are nineteen charges, and eighteen clergymen, "to which there are about to be added, one at Nairne, one at Lochgilphead in Argyleshire, and one at Kinlochmoidart, in Invernesshire." It is lamentable to remark that six at least of the original charges have unfaithfully discontinued the use of the national communion office; in two only—Keith and Abercherder—is it retained. The discarding the national witness of catholic doctrine was soon followed by Mr. Hull at Huntly, one of the self-styled evangelical class, rebelling against his bishop. He preached for sir William Dunbar in Aberdeen, and that schismatic preached for him in Huntly whilst Mr. Hull's infant son, who had been drowned in the garden pond, lay unburied! After a protracted correspondence with bishop Low, his ordinary, this man has followed the example of Drummond and Dunbar, and not only so, but has laid the foundation of his schism in his eldest son, and withdrawn both the congregation and the chapel from the communion of the church. These schismatics imagine that they only separate from the Scottish branch of the catholic church; but, in reality, they have separated from the whole Anglican catholic church, as well as from the church universal. They stand alone; and are cast forth as a branch, and are *withered*. They all affect to belong to the church of England; but to which of the bishops do they pay canonical obedience? or which of the bishops gives them the benefit of episcopal superintendence? It is to be hoped that there is still as much life in the church of England as will make them feel that they are excommunicated schismatics when they attempt to exercise their office within her jurisdiction².

HERE IS, HOWEVER, an unhappy state of things, which is one of the evils attending the want of an establishment; that rebellious presbyters with their disobedient congregations can play fast and loose with the church, and whenever a Deotrehan spirit seizes the pastor, and a rebellious one the people,

¹ Private Letters.—Aberdeen Almanack.—Author's own recollections.

² Private Communications.—Aberdeen Almanack.

that they declare themselves independent, and so make the episcopal office impotent !

DURING A PERIOD of three hundred and seventeen years over which this history has extended, we have witnessed a multitude of changes, and the exhibition of the worst and the most malignant passions. We have seen the total overthrow and extinction of the Scoto-papal church, the rise of Knox's nominal and imperfect episcopal polity, and its eventually merging into a real episcopacy. The commencement of the presbyterian system under Andrew Melville, its real founder, in Scotland, has been truly developed ; its long struggle for pre-eminence, its short-lived establishment, its never-ceasing turbulence, and its frequent open rebellions ; its incessant grasping at power ; its close imitation of papal infallibility, treachery, and intolerance ; its league with the sacrilegious plunderers of the church's property ; its having involved the three kingdoms in rebellion and bloodshed ; its barter and sale of the king's person, and consent to his murder ; its having compelled the royal family of the Stuarts to sojourn in popish countries, where they were corrupted from pure religion, and where they apostatised to the idolatry of Rome ; its hypocrisy and tyranny during the commonwealth ; the utter dissolution of morals, and the supremacy of hypocrisy, under its superintendence ; its crouching and slavish subjection to an usurper ; its bullying and insolence to the lawful sovereign ; its turbulence and persecution of the episcopal clergy during the reigns of the royal brothers ; its merciless and long-continued rabbling and persecution of the church, during and after the Revolution ; and its internal dissensions, secessions, and the final disruption of the ministers of its communion, who, however, represent the genuine spirit of presbytery.

A TRUE AND FAITHFUL history has been given of the first implantation of the church ; her struggles in the southern division of the kingdom with the adherents of presbytery ; her destruction and extinction by the union of the presbyterians with the sacrilegious nobility ; her abeyance for twenty-three years, and her revival with the restoration of the monarchy. In the detail of the calamities and afflictions that she sustained at the hand of the presbyterians, in the diocese of Glasgow ; the cruel rabbling, the starvation, the loss of life, property, and reputation, which the episcopal clergy sustained subsequent to the Revolution ; I most solemnly declare that I have neither exaggerated the circumstances nor even come up to the sworn and attested accounts of the sufferers and other competent witnesses. The arts of rebels, working on the sus-

ceptible minds of prejudiced presbyterians, prevented the adoption of a Liturgy and of the Christian Creed, which operated injuriously to the church as a national institution ; hence “ the power and beauty of the catholic system never has been exhibited to the people of Scotland in its fulness. The church, in the time of her establishment under the Stuarts, appeared as nothing *but* an episcopacy, without catholic creed or catholic ritual ; and men thought she might gain upon the community, *because* she presented no external difference from *sectarianism*. Hence she had no hold upon the great mass of the people, who fell away in the first storm of persecution¹.” As soon as the church escaped from the alliance and tyranny of the state, she was no longer “ heralded by acts of parliament,” but became the subject of its persecuting and cruel enactments ; she almost immediately presented “ a catholic *creed* and a catholic *ritual*” to her faithful children ; but as these came only gradually to be adopted, they wanted the advantage of the synodical consent and authority of the whole church. Hence the diversities of customs, and the absence of uniformity, which characterise the Scottish branch of the church to this day, and the lingering remnants of presbyterian customs, already mentioned, that mar her beauty and lessen her utility. Recent afflictions and chastenings, which for the present are not joyous, but grievous, will, in time, yield the peaceable fruit of righteousness of life and uniformity of ritual practice. She may rejoice and be comforted in the purgation of her communion from such unfilial and unfaithful ministers as have been expelled from her society ; but it is a source of great sorrow that they have succeeded in drawing the laity along with them into their apostacy. A tree is to be known by its fruit ; and this falling away of the laity is the *effect* of the uncatholic teaching of these intruding ministers.

HOW DESIRABLE would it be if some means could be devised to prevent such men from fixing themselves in the bowels of the church, and acting as a canker to destroy the whole body. In this instance again the Church Society is invaluable. It can afford of its abundance to maintain a catholic clergyman in Huntly, where the last act of treacherous apostacy was committed, to minister in an upper room to such of the faithful as may see their error, and renounce the schism of Hull and his noble patroness. It is surely a pity, and perchance it is sinful, to hoard up money collected for the immediate and real necessities of the church. It is in some degree a mistrusting

¹ Cheyne's Synodical Sermon, 1844, note E, pp. 25, 26.

the good providence of God; and it cannot carry a blessing along with it. It is needless to repeat of what benefit this fund has already been to thirty-two priests, who have had some few comforts added to their many temporal wants; but to how many more might it not be a source of comfort, were it not hoarded up for no conceivable purpose! But this hoarding system will defeat itself; for men will not *add to a heap*, although they will cheerfully contribute to the immediate comforts of those who are freely giving of that treasure which they themselves have freely received.

ALTHOUGH THE church of Scotland has enjoyed external rest for nearly the last half century, yet this prosperity has not been so beneficial to her as might have been expected. The independent schism still remains as a thorn in her sides and as pricks in her eyes; and her prosperity has attracted uncatholic and self-seeking clergymen from England and Ireland to court and obtain all her best preferments, that God and nature intended as the birthright of her own sons. It is not fair nor generous for these men to drive the native priests into, I may say, the wilderness of poverty and obscurity, and so compel them to depend on the Church Society to place them above want. In the late revolts none of the native clergy have been involved; they have "still kept their bosoms franchised and allegiance clear." Whereas, no sooner had the independents made parties for themselves, and their respective bishops had meekly admonished them to obey canons which they had subscribed and sworn to obey, than they declare themselves no longer subject to episcopal jurisdiction. Had they only to answer for themselves alone, at the great and terrible day of the Lord, they might be allowed to choose the evil and refuse the good at their own discretion; but they have also to answer for the souls of all those unhappy men whom they have dragged into their schism, and deprived of the means of grace in this world, and of the hopes of heaven in the next. The Scottish ordained clergy cannot even occasionally officiate in England without the formality of asking and obtaining episcopal authority, far less obtain livings in it. Yet when their meek, obedient, and uncomplaining deportment at home is contrasted with the intolerant and turbulent conduct of those who have coveted and seized their birthrights, it is easy to discover whence the recent calamities which have afflicted that church have arisen. When lawful authority prevents the latter from "doing when they like and where they like," they bring a railing accusation of popery against the national communion office, proclaim themselves more holy than

the obedient clergy, and not only so, but, in the spirit of modern liberality, but of real intolerance, they demand that the church shall yield up that witness for the faith which, amidst suffering and obloquy, she has still preserved.

WERE THE FUNDS of the Church Society worked to their full extent, a temporary place of worship might be procured in every village where two or three could be gathered together; these would soon swell into congregations of faithful men. After the casting up of so much mire and dirt in the troubled sea of presbytery, religious and earnest-minded people would gladly accept the gentle and placid stream of the church, flowing out of that "pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb," and proceeding by succession, as we have seen¹, directly from Christ and his apostles. They may see it still continuing to flow, and they may recognise God's promise that it shall for ever flow till it be lost in eternity, when there shall be "a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and earth shall pass away, and there shall be no more sea" to set up mire and dirt, "and God shall wipe away all tears from the eyes of the faithful, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain." Let us, therefore, be faithful unto death, that we may obtain the crown of life, which the Lord the righteous judge will give to all them that love His appearing.

I NOW CONCLUDE these volumes in the words of the bishop of Edinburgh, in his Charge delivered in the year 1842:—The principle of low churchmen is to consider personal religion and Divine grace as acts immediate between God and the soul of each believer. On the other hand, it is the characteristic belief of high churchmen, that God has appointed, under Christ, one great channel, the Church, through which solely his grace may, with full assurance, be expected to flow. There can be no doubt that the Scottish episcopal church has, during its whole existence, been characteristically high church; and it is my conviction that it would, to a certain extent, depart from the truth as it is in Jesus, if it were to change this its character."

¹ Ante, pp. 622-624.

APPENDIX.

THE FOLLOWING list of the Scottish bishops from the consecration of archbishop Sharp, with the dates and places of consecration and the names of the consecrators, was drawn up by an undergraduate of Wadham College, Oxford, from approved sources. I have, however, made some alterations in it, to correspond with the historical evidence contained in this work, for the general accuracy of which I think I can vouch, having given the authorities at foot, from whom my information was derived.

No.	Name of Bishop.	Name of See.	Place and Date of Consecration.	Names of Consecrators.
1.	James Sharp murdered May 3, 1679	St. Andrews	Westminster Abbey, Sunday, December 15, 1661,	Gilbert London (Sheldon).
2.	Andrew Fairfoul..... died Nov. 1663	Glasgow		George Worcester (Morley).
3.	Robert Leighton ^a	Dunblane		Richard Carlisle (Sterne).
4.	James Hamilton..... died 1674	Galloway		Hugh Landaff (Lloyd).
5.	George Haliburton died 1664	Dunkeld	Chapel Royal, Edinburgh, May 7, 1662,	1. James St. Andrews (Sharpe).
6.	Murdoch Mackenzie ^b ..	Moray		2. Andrew Glasgow (Fairfoul).
7.	John Patterson	Ross		4. James Galloway (Hamilton).
8.	Robert Wallace	The Isles		
9.	George Wishart	Edinburgh	St. Andrews, June 1, 1662,	1. James St. Andrews.
10.	David Mitchell	Aberdeen		2. Andrew Glasgow.
11.	David Strachan	Brechin		4. James Galloway.
12.	Patrick Forbes	Caithness		
13.	Alexander Burnet ^c	Aberdeen	September, 1663,	1. James St. Andrews, and other bishops.
14.	Patrick Scougal	Aberdeen	Easter-day, 10th April, 1664, 1664, 1666,	1. James St. Andrews, and other bishops.
15.	Andrew Honyman ..	Orkney		1. As above.
16.	Henry Guthry.....	Dunkeld		13. Alexander Glasgow and other bishops.
17.	William Scrogie, D.D. ^d ..	Argyle		1. James St. Andrews, and other bishops.
18.	Alexander Young, D.D. }	Edinburgh	1671,	1. As above.
19.	Robert Laurie	Brechin		
20.	James Ramsay	Dunblane		

^a Commendator of Glasgow, 28th October, 1671 : resigned August, 1674, died 1684.
^b Trans. to Orkney 14th Feb. 1678 : died February, 1688.
^c Trans. to Glasgow 1664 ; deprived Dec. 1669 ; restored Sept. 1674 ; trans. to St. Andrews 1670 ; died 24th August, 1684.
^d Vide ante, vol. ii. p. 553.
^e Leighton resigned in August, 1674.

No.	Name of Bishop.	Name of Sec.	Place and Date of Consecration.	Names of Consecrators.
21.	John Patterson ^a	Galloway	Edinburgh, May, 1675, 1675,	13. Alexander Glasgow
22.	Arthur Ross	Argyle		18. Alexander Edinbg. and another bishop
23.	Andrew Wood ^b	The Isles		Alexander Glasgow and other bishops.
24.	William Lindsay	Dunkeld	May 7, 1675,	1. James St. Andrews, and other bishops.
25.	James Aitken ^c	Moray		1. James St. Andrews, and other bishops.
26.	George Haliburton ^d	Brechin	1678,	13. Alexander St. An- drews, and other prelates.
27.	Andrew Bruce ^e	Dunkeld	28th Oct. 1679,	13. As above.
28.	Colin Falconar	Argyle		13. As above.
29.	Hector Maclean	Argyle		13. As above.
30.	Archibald Graham	The Isles	1680,	13. As above.
31.	Robert Douglass	Brechin	1682,	13. As above.
32.	Alexander Cairncross ^f ..	Ditto	19th June, 1684, 25th Dec. 1684,	22. Arthur St. Andrews, and other bishops.
33.	James Drummond, D.D.	Ditto	in Holyrood-house	22. Arthur St. Andrews, as above.
34.	Alexander Ross ^g	Moray	8th March, 1687,	22. Arthur St. Andrews, as above.
35.	John Hamilton ^h	Dunkeld	At St. Andrews, on St. Andrew's-day,	22. Arthur St. Andrews, and other bishops.
36.	William Hay, D.D.	Moray	March, 1688,	21. John Glasgow, and other bishops.
37.	John Gordon	Galloway	4th Feb. 1688, at Glasgow,	21. John Glasgow.
38.	John Sage	College ⁱ	Edinburgh,	34. Alexander Edinbg.
39.	John Fullarton ^j	Edinburgh,	25th Jan. 1706,	31. Robert Dunblane.
40.	John Falconar	Fife, Brechin, ^k	Dundee, 28th April	34. Alexander Edinbg.
41.	Henry Christie	&c. College,		31. Robert Dunblane.
42.	Hon. Archibald Camp- bell	College, Aug. 24, 1711	Dundee, St. Bartho- lomew's-day, 24th August, 1711,	34. Alexander Edinbg.
43.	James Gadderar, D.D. ^l	Aberdeen,	London, St. Mathias's-day, 24th Feb. 1712,	31. Robert Dunblane.
44.	Arthur Millar	Edinburgh,	Edinburgh, 23d Oct. 1718,	40. John Fife, &c.
45.	William Irvine	College,		42. Archibald Camp- bell, College.

^a Law's Memorials, p. 77, cited by Mr. Lawson, vol. ii. 30. It was only since the above was printed that I have been able to refer to these Memorials. Law says that the archbishop of Glasgow was the consecrator, assisted by the bishop of Edinburgh, and another bishop in Edinburgh. He also says, "for a long time did this bishop [Leighton] still offer this [his resignation], though he did not mean it, as it seemed by his after dealings; therefore, what he did in jest was taken in earnest by the king and Lauderdale, his secretary; and he got a bill of ease, and is set off. . . . Mr. Alexander Burnet, who before was archbishop of Glasgow . . . is reponed again (. . .) comes to Glasgow, takes possession of his place, and keeps a synod the second Tuesday of October, 1674." Therefore as Dr. Leighton resigned in August, 1674, he could not have been the consecrator; for archbishop Burnet was then in the full possession of his episcopal authority. The latter of these prelates was translated to Galloway 5th September, 1679; to Glasgow 15th October, 1679, and to St. Andrews 31st October, 1684; he died 13th June, 1704. The former prelate was translated to Edinburgh 28th March, 1679; to Glasgow 21st January, 1687, and died 8th December, 1708, p. 70.—T. S.

^b Vide ante, iii. 42.

^c Trans. to Galloway, 6th February, 1680; died 28th October, 1687.

^d Trans. to Aberdeen, 1682; died 29th September, 1715.

^e Vide ante, vol. iii. pp. 190, 191.

^f Vide ante, vol. iii. p. 254; trans. to Glasgow the same year.

^g Trans. to Edinburgh, Sept. same year; vicar-general, 1704; died 20th March, 1720.

^h This prelate was lineally descended from an illegitimate son of archbishop Hamilton, the last Romish primate. He survived the Revolution, and died one of the ministers of Edinburgh, and sub-dean of his majesty's chapel royal.

ⁱ This denotes that they were consecrated "bishops at large," without sees.

^j Vicar-general and metropolitan.

^k Vide ante, vol. iv. p. 80.

^l Vide ante, vol. iii. p. 551.

^m Although afterwards bishop of Edinburgh, yet at the time of this consecration he had no diocese.

No.	Name of Bishop.	See.	Place and Date of Consecration.	Consecrators.
46.	Andrew Cant	College,	17th Oct. 1722,	39. John Edinburgh.
47.	David Freebairn *	Ditto,		44. Arthur Millar.
48.	Alexander Duncan	Glasgow,	In the beginning of winter, 1774,	45. William Irvine.
49.	Robert Kerr	Brechin,		39. John Edinburgh.
50.	John Ochterlounie	Brechin,	November, 1726,	44. Arthur Millar.
51.	James Ross	Fife, &c.		45. William Irvine.
52.	Thomas Rattray, D.D.	Dunkeld,	At Edinburgh, 4th June,	47. David Freebairn (College).
				48. Alexander Glasgow
53.	John Gillan	College,	At Edinburgh, 22d June, 1727,	46. Andrew Cant (College).
54.	David Rankine	Ditto,		44. Arthur Edinburgh
55.	William Dunbar	Moray,	18th June, 1827, Edinburgh,	43. James Aberdeen.
56.	Robert Keith	Fife,		46. Andrew Cant (College).
57.	Andrew Lumsden	Edinburgh,	2d Nov. 1727,	47. David Freebairn (College).
58.	Robert White	Dunblane,	24th June, 1725, Canabank,	48. Alexander Glasgow
59.	William Falconer	Orkney and Caithness,		51. James Fife.
60.	James Raitt	Brechin,	4th Oct. 1742, Edinburgh,	50. John Brechin.
61.	John Alexander	Dunkeld,	Edinburgh, 19th August, 1743,	44. Arthur Millar.
62.	Andrew Gerard	Aberdeen		43. James Aberdeen.
63.	Henry Edgar	Coadjutor to the primus	Cupar in Fife, 17th July, 1747	52. Thomas Dunkeld.
64.	Robert Forbes	Ross, Caithness, and Orkney	Forfar, 24th June, 1762	52. Thomas Dunkeld.
65.	Robert Kilgour	Aberdeen	Cupar in Fife, 21st Sept. 1768	56. Robert Fife.
66.	Charles Rose	Dunblane	Forfar, St. Bartholomew's Day, 24th Aug. 1774	58. Robert Dunblane.
67.	Arthur Petrie	Moray, coadjutor	Dundee, 27th June, 1776.	52. Thomas Dunkeld, and Primus.

* Elected to Edinburgh, and primus.

† Vide vol. iv. p. 248; elected primus 1727.

‡ Trans. to Aberdeen, 1753.

§ Trans. to Moray, 1742; to Edinburgh, 1776; elected primus, 1761.

|| Reckoned bishop of Edinburgh on his election to the primacy, 1743.

¶ Primus.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Name of Bishop.</i>	<i>Name of Sec.</i>	<i>Place and Date of Consecration.</i>	<i>Consecrators.</i>
68.	George Innes	Brechin	{ Alloa, 13th August, 1778,	{ 59. Wm Edinburgh. 66. Charles Dunblane. 67. Arthur Moray.
69.	John Skinner ^a	Aberdeen	{ Luthermuir, 25th Sept. 1782,	{ 65. Robert Aberdeen. 66. Charles Dunblane. 67. Arthur Moray.
70.	Andrew Macfarlane	Ross, &c.	{ Peterhead, 7th March, 1787,	{ 65. Robert Aberdeen. 67. Arthur and Ross Argyle.
71.	Wm. Abernethy Drum- } mond ^b	Brechin	{ Peterhead, 26th September, 1787,	{ 99. John co. Aberdeen. 65. Robert Aberdeen. 69. John co. Aberdeen.
72.	John Strachan	Co. Brechin	{ 70. Andrew Ross and Argyle.	{ 69. John Aberdeen. 70. Andrew Ross, &c. 71. William Brechin.
73.	Jonathan Watson	Dunkeld	{ Stonehaven, 20th Sept. 1792,	{ 72. John co. Brechin. 71. Wm. Edinburgh. ^c
74.	Alexander Jolly, D.D. ...	Moray	{ St. John Baptist. 24th June, 1796, Dundee,	{ 70. Andrew Ross, &c. 72. John Brechin. 69. John Aberdeen.
75.	Daniel Sandford, D.D. ...	Edinburgh	{ 9th February, 1806, Aberdeen,	{ 73. Jonathan Dunkeld. 74. Alexander Moray. 69. John Aberdeen.
76.	Patrick Torrey, D.D. ^d ...	{ Dunkeld and Dunblane	{ 12th October, 1808, Aberdeen,	{ 70. Andrew Ross, &c. 74. Alexander Moray. 69. John Aberdeen.
77.	George Gleig, LL. D. ...	Brechin	{ 30th October, 1808,	{ 74. Alexander Moray. 76. Patri ^d Dunkeld, &c.
78.	William Skinner, D.D. ...	Aberdeen	{ Stirling, 27th October, 1816,	{ 77. George Brechin. 74. Alexander Moray. 75. Daniel Edinburgh.
79.	David Low, LL. D.	{ Ross and Ar- gyle	{ Stirling, 14th November, 1819,	{ 76. Patrick Dunkeld. 77. George Brechin. 74. Alexander Moray.
	Mathew H. Luscombe, } D.D.	To go abroad	{ Stirling, 20th Mar. 1830,	{ 76. Patrick Dunkeld. 77. George Brechin. 75. Daniel Edinburgh.
80.	James Walker	Edinburgh	{ Stirling, 7th March, 1830,	{ 79. David Ross, &c. 77. George Brechin. 74. Alexander Moray.
81.	Michael Russell, LL. D. } & D.C.L.	Glasgow	{ Edinburgh, 8th October, 1837	{ 78. William Aberdeen. 79. David Ross, &c. 76. Patrick Dunkeld.
82.	David Moir, LL. D.	Brechin	{ 78. William Aberdeen. 79. David Ross, &c.	{ 76. Patrick Dunkeld. 78. William Aberdeen. 79. David Ross, &c.
83.	Charles Hughes Ter- } rott, D.D.	Edinburgh	{ Aberdeen, 2d June, 1841,	{ 81. Michael Glasgow. 82. David Brechin.

^a Elected primus in 1789.^b Trans. to Edinburgh, 1787; resigned, 1806.^c Elected primus *pro hac vice*.^d The diocese of St. Andrews was put under his superintendence, and he is now styled bishop of St. Andrews.

No.	Name of Bishop.	See.	Place and Date of Consecration.	Consecrators.
46.	Andrew Cant	College,	17th Oct. 1722,	39. John Edinburgh.
47.	David Freebairn ^a	Ditto,		44. Arthur Millar.
48.	Alexander Duncan	Glasgow,	In the beginning of winter, 1774,	45. William Irvine.
49.	Robert Norrie	Brechin,		39. John Edinburgh.
50.	John Ochterlonte	Brechin,	November, 1726,	44. Arthur Millar.
51.	James Rose	Fife, &c.		45. William Irvine.
52.	Thomas Rattray, D.D.	Dunkeld,	At Edinburgh, 4th June,	47. David Freebairn (College).
53.	John Gillan	College,		48. Alexander Glasgow
54.	David Rankine	Ditto,	At Edinburgh, 22d June, 1727,	46. Andrew Cant (College).
55.	William Dunbar ^c	Moray,		44. Arthur Millar.
56.	Robert Keith	Fife,	16th June, 1827, Edinburgh,	43. James Aberdeen.
57.	Andrew Lumsden	Edinburgh,		46. Andrew Cant (College).
58.	Robert White	Dunblane,	24th June, 1725, Carsbank,	47. David Freebairn (College).
59.	William Falconar ^d	Orkneys and Caithness,		48. Alexander Glasgow
60.	James Raitt	Brechin,	10th Sept. 1741, Alloa,	51. James Fife.
61.	John Alexander	Dunkeld,		50. John Brechin.
62.	Andrew Gerard	Aberdeen	4th Oct. 1742, Edinburgh,	44. Arthur Millar.
63.	Henry Edgar	Coadjutor to the primus		43. James Aberdeen.
64.	Robert Forbes	Ross, Caithness, and Orkney	Edinburgh, 19th August, 1743,	52. Thomas Dunkeld.
65.	Robert Kilgour ^e	Aberdeen		53. Thomas Dunkeld.
66.	Charles Rose	Dunblane	Cupar in Fife, 17th July, 1747	46. Andrew Cant (College).
67.	Arthur Petrie	Moray, coadjutor		56. Robert Fife.

^a Elected to Edinburgh, and primus.

^b Vide vol. iv. p. 248; elected primus 1727.

^c Trans. to Aberdeen, 1733.

^d Trans. to Moray, 1742; to Edinburgh, 1776; elected primus, 1781.

^e Reckoned bishop of Edinburgh on his election to the primacy, 1743.

^f Primus.

<i>Name of Bishop.</i>	<i>Name of See.</i>	<i>Place and Date of Consecration.</i>	<i>Consecrators.</i>
James Innes	Brechin	Alton, 13th August, 1778,	59. Wm Edinburgh. 66. Charles Dunblane.
James Skinner	Aberdeen	Luthermuir, 23th Sept. 1782,	67. Arthur Moray. 65. Robert Aberdeen.
James Macfarlane	Ross, &c.	Peterhead, 7th March, 1787,	66. Charles Dunblane. 67. Arthur Moray 65. Robert Aberdeen.
Abernethy Drummond and Strachan	Brechin Co. Brechin	Peterhead, 26th September, 1787,	67. Arthur and Ross Argyle. 99. John co. Aberdeen.
James Watson	Dunkeld	Stonehaven, 20th Sept. 1792,	65. Robert Aberdeen. 69. John co. Aberdeen.
James Jolly, D.D.	Moray	Dundee, St. John Baptist. 24th June, 1796,	70. Andrew Ross and 72. John Brechin.
James Sandford, D.D.	Edinburgh	Dundee, 9th February, 1803,	71. Wm. Edinburgh. 70. Andrew Ross, &c.
James Torrey, D.D.	Dunkeld and Dunblane	Aberdeen, 12th October, 1808,	72. John Aberdeen. 73. Jonathan Dunkeld.
James Gleig, LL.D.	Brechin	Aberdeen, 30th October, 1808,	74. Alexander Moray. 69. John Aberdeen.
James Skinner, D.D.	Aberdeen	Stirling, 27th October, 1816,	74. Alexander Moray. 75. Daniel Edinburgh.
Low, LL.D.	Ross and Ar- gyle	Stirling, 14th November, 1819,	76. Patrick Dunkeld. 77. George Brechin.
James H. Luscombe, D.	To go abroad	Stirling, 30th Mar. 1830,	74. Alexander Moray. 76. Patrick Dunkeld.
Walker	Edinburgh	Stirling, 7th March, 1830,	77. George Brechin. 75. Daniel Edinburgh.
James Russell, LL.D.	Glasgow	Edinburgh, 8th October, 1837	79. David Ross, &c. 80. James Edinburgh.
James Moir, LL.D.	Brechin		78. William Aberdeen. 79. David Ross, &c.
James Hughes Ter- D.D.	Edinburgh	Aberdeen, 2d June, 1841,	76. Patrick Dunkeld. 78. William Aberdeen.
			79. David Ross, &c. 81. Michael Glasgow. 82. David Brechin.

ed primus in 1789.

s. to Edinburgh, 1787; resigned, 1805.

ed primus pro Aecleia.

Diocese of St. Andrews was put under his superintendence, and he is now
shop of St. Andrews.



INDEX.

- Abbey's.** i. 152.
Abdication. iii. 393, 394.
Aberdeen, bishop of. i. 589, 650.—ii. 6.
 ——— city of, &c. i. 573.—ii. 3, 5, 6, 17, 39.
 ——— synod of. ii. 429.—iii. 297, 486, 597.
Abernethy Drummond, bishop. iv. 411, 443, 447—death of, 483.
Abbot of Paisley. i. 22, 37.
Abbott, archbishop. i. 475, 476, 544.—ii. 243, 244.
Acts of Assembly. i. 247, 249, 251, 280, 289, 330, 345, 375, 405, 483, 633.—
 ii. 23, 33-40, 67, 101, 108, 128, 142, 154, 169, 171, 187, 283, 312.—iv. 28,
 29, 39, 449, 489, 497.
Acts of parliament. i. 13, 14, 25, 315, 346, 404, 481, 502, 504, 528.—iii. 217,
 282, 286, 587, 598, 599, 600, 611, 626, 651.—iv. 15, 72—penal, 327-329,
 332-335, 354, 575—repeal of, 420-423, 428-433.
Acts of the Convention-Parliament. iii. 429, 466.
Act of Humiliation. ii. 169, 170.
Accommodation. ii. 597, 598, 643, 653.
Addresses. iv. 501-503, 530, 536-538, 545, 546, 574, 598.
Adamson, archbishop. i. 270, 272, 285, 298, 315, 318, 322, 331, 334, 343, 357.
Airs-Moss. iii. 201-203.
Aitken, bishop. ii. 316.—iii. 68, 194, 300, 329.
 ——— Roger. iv. 439-441.
Aless, Alexander. i. 7.
Alexander, bishop. iv. 293, 294, 310—death of, 389.
 ——— Rev. J. iv. 615, 616.
American church. iv. 395-402, 409-411.
Arminius, James. i. 500, 521.
Angus, earl of. i. 375, 377, 387, 442.
Annan, Rev. — i. 556.
Anne, queen. iii. 636.—iv. 101, 102.
Annexation, Act of. i. 432.
Apostolical succession. i. 19, 139, 144, 147, 452, 509.
Apostles' Creed. i. 136, 294.
Apostles. i. 264, 265.
Apocrypha. iv. 520.
Archbishop, what. i. 124.
Argyle, marquis of. i. 593, 620, 621, 629, 651.—ii. 39, 64, 73, 96, 97, 98, 112,
 116, 158, 181, 200, 212, 216, 217, 234, 347, 351, 367, 398, 416-419.—iii.
 221, 231-233, 258, 283-287, 289, 290.
Arran, Earl of. i. 18, 21, 23, 155.
Assaults on the clergy. ii. 625, 626, 629, 632, 633, 634, 666, 668, 677, 678, 689.
 —iii. 41, 42, 57.
Assembly of 1638. i. 589, 590. Session i. 591; ii. 592; iii. 593; iv. v. vi. 594;
 vii. 612, 620—i. viii., ii. ix., iii. x. 623; iv. xi. 624; v. xii. 625; vi. xiii. 626;
 vii. xiv. 626; viii. xv., ix. xvi. 628: x. xvii., xi. xviii. 629; xii. xix. 630;
 xiii. xx. 630; xiv. xxi., xv. xxii., xvi. xxiii., xvii. xxiv., xviii. xxv. 632; xix. xxvi.
 633.—iv. 562, 563.
Assertory Act. ii. 620.—iii. 11, 35, 38, 228, 230, 315, 472, 473.
Assurance, oath of. iii. 478, 479, 514, 518, 520, 583, 586, 588.
Atheism. i. 422, 423.
Auchterarder, case of. iv. 149, 535, 536, 548-550, 570, 612.

- Baillie, Principal.** i. 611.—ii. 379, 436, 441, 455.
Balmerino, lord. i. 444, 514, 524, 531, 542.—ii. 134, 141, 167.
Bancroft, archbishop. i. 403.
Balcanghal, Walter. i. 324.
Banff. iv. 436, 474, 575.
Balfour, John, of Burley. iii. 151, 156.
Basilicon, Doron. i. 410, 413.
Battlea. ii. 111, 141, 145, 156, 157, 273, 275, 276, 330, 345, 350, 564.
Beaton, archbishop James. i. 4, 7, 9, 10.
 ——— David, archbishop and cardinal. i. 8, 9, 12, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29, 32, 33.
 ——— archbishop of Glasgow. i. 227, 410, 417, 455, 655.
Beith, Archibald. ii. 677.
Bell, Rev. Robert. iii. 366-369.
 ——— Sir John. iii. 386, 654, 655,
Berwick. ii. 8, 9, 14, 18.
Beza. i. 126, 142, 261, 279.
Bible, reading of prohibited. i. 26.
Binning, lord. i. 493-497.
Bishops. i. 122, 412—protest, 595-611, 612.—ii. 21, 22, 24.
 ——— rents. iv. 100.
Blair, Robert. ii. 30, 162, 163, 164, 176.
Blairs, seminary of. i. 207.
Black, David. i. 990.
Blackadder, archbishop of Glasgow. i. 3.
Blackness Castle. i. 21.
Bond of Peace. ii. 581, 583, 589.—iii. 78, 96.
Book of Discipline, First. i. 107, 149, 170, 196.
 ——— Second. i. 271, 273, 276, 280, 341.
 ——— of Common Order. i. 202, 293, 294.
Borthwick, Sir John. i. 13.
Bothwell, earl of. i. 188.—Francis, 342, 378, 379, 382, 353.
 ——— bridge. iii. 176-179, 181.
Boucher, Rev. Jonathan. iv. 443.
Bourignon, Mademoiselle. iii. 627.
Boyd, archbishop. i. 271, 281.
Brechin, bishoprick of. i. 157, 627, 631, 650-
Breda. ii. 303, 376.
Brethren. i. 274.
Brotherly assistance. ii. 65, 78.
Brownism. ii. 110, 173.
Bruce, Robert. i. 135, 330, 338, 376, 378, 387, 393, 395, 407, 419, 425.
 ——— bishop. iii. 300, 304, 329, 626.
Duchannan, George. i. 9, 132, 190, 309, 316.
Burnings. i. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 29, 30, 38, 42, 56.
Burnet, bishop of Sarum. ii. 394, 554-557, 591, 605, 624, 631, 647, 651, 664, 668, 678.—iii. 4, 24, 25, 27, 82, 87, 122, 133, 159, 164, 193, 259, 307, 328, 357, 544.
 ——— archbishop. ii. 508, 533, 535, 541, 551, 569, 570, 593, 614, 615, 617, 618, 627.—iii. 6, 100, 101, 166, 185, 209, 210, 233, 253, 254, 339.
Cairncross, archbishop. iii. 253, 255, 314, 315.
Caithness, bishop of. i. 630, 651.
Callander, earl of. ii. 212.
Calvin, John. 120, 499.
Campbell, bishop. iv. 70, 79, 148, 165, 180, 181.
 ——— doctor. iv. 461.
Cambuslang. iv. 287-289.
Cameron, Richard, and the Cameronians. ii. 667.—iii. 58, 73, 143, 195, 196, 200, 202, 558, 612.
Canaries, Dr. iii. 313-315, 564.

- Cant, Andrew. ii. 31, 147, 148, 181.
 — bishop. iv. 178, 251.
 Canons. i. 546.—iv. 251, 252, 295-298.
 Cargill, John. iii. 168—Donald, 175, 195, 196, 199, 200, 203, 214.
 Carnwath, earl of. ii. 71, 80, 155.
 Carstares, John. ii. 667, 680.—iii. Dr. 258, 321, 427, 589.—iv. 9, 11, 16, 73, 86.
 Catechism, Larger and Shorter. ii. 219.
 Cathedrals unroofed. i. 207.
 Catholic church. ii. 461, 462, 463.
 Caveats. i. 408, 409.
 Cess. iii. 114, 115.
 Charles I. i. 421, 512, 515, 526, 529, 555, 561, 646.—ii. 3, 9, 12, 20, 32, 43, 45, 57, 70, 74, 76, 79, 83, 89, 98, 103, 117, 140, 146, 167, 173, 174, 175, 178, 179, 194, 198, 228, 244, 272, 276, 279, 280, 285, 286-301.—His trial, &c.—iii. 288-299.
 Charles II. i. 523.—ii. 303, 308, 316, 319, 320, 333, 337, 344, 346, 348, 385, 395, 422, 465, 477, 479.—iii. 133, 180, 182, 189, 204, 235, 236, 243—his death, 269, 276.
 Charles Edward. iv. 318-322, 338-340, 353, 412, 413.
 Chapel Royal. i. 155, 190.
 Chapels. iv. 31, 32.
 Chatelherault, duke of. i. 81, 95, 209, 221.
 Chillingworth. i. 291.
 Church property. i. 157, 158, 191, 225.
 — Society. iv. 531-534, 560-562, 567-570, 577-579, 589, 600.
 — of England. i. 131, 186.
 Christmas-day. i. 488, 498.
 Christie, bishop. iv. 38, 39, 150.
 Christian Knowledge Society. iv. 386.
 Claim of right. iii. 404.
 Classes, act of. ii. 234, 307, 315, 340, 341.
 Clement, Pope VIII. i. 422, 430, 444.
 Clergy. iv. 32, 84, 128, 135, 141, 142-146, 212, 261, 300-305, 309, 311-313, 325, 331, 335, 345, 352, 373.
 — curates, &c. ii. 506, 507, 515.
 — treatment of. iii. 99, 100, 101, 296, 362-371, 379, 384-388, 402, 410, 433-436, 438, 439, 441-443, 445, 474, 483, 525-529, 535, 552, 523, 556, 558, 571, 577, 607, 611, 613, 625, 640, 642.
 College of Bishops. iv. 68, 180, 183, 225, 236, 259, 265.
 Collier, bishop. iv. 167.
 Comedians. i. 411.
 Commissioners of the kirk. i. 403.
 Commission (special). iii. 536, 555, 556, 559, 563, 565, 603.
 — (the). iv. 12, 13, 16, 17, 31, 73, 76, 81, 135, 217, 448.
 — of the kirk. ii. 108, 109, 111, 113, 114, 131, 133, 134, 145, 147, 151, 156, 159, 160, 165, 167, 173, 177, 182, 192, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 213, 217, 229, 308, 309, 318, 321, 328, 330, 332, 334, 337, 339, 340, 342, 351, 361.—iii. 61, 555, 571, 591, 597, 612, 660.
 Committee of estates. ii. 35, 38, 60, 133, 159, 167, 174, 182, 196-198, 224, 277, 325, 330, 333, 334, 399, 577.
 Common Prayer. i. 52, 132.
 Communion-office. iv. 202, 300, 379, 381-384, 468.
 Cockburn, Rev. — iv. 95, 96, 108.
 Concordate. iv. 219, 220, 262, 264.
 Confession of Faith. i.—Knox's. i. 95, 98, 99, 149, 196, 198.
 Confirmation. iv. 93, 370, 371.
 Congregation. i. 51, 58, 60, 65, 69, 73, 83, 85.
 — Lords of the. i. 52, 65, 67, 74, 79, 85, 86.
 — for propagating the Faith. i. 52.

- Conn, Monsieur.** ii. 51.
Connachar, Rev. James. iv. 358-362.
Conservators of the peace. ii. 76.
Consecrations. i. 460, 466, 477, 488, 501, 521, 538, 542, 545, 550.—ii. 449, 450, 452, 470, 471, 472, 489, 491, 531, 664.—iii. 42, 68, 190, 191, 254, 255, 306, 316, 329, 551.—iv. 7, 8, 38, 39, 70, 80, 98, 177, 224, 230, 239, 250, 256, 274, 286, 287, 294, 370, 377, 378, 384, 389, 391, 400, 407, 411, 438, 447, 477, 488, 495, 497, 498, 507, 547, 586.
Constantinople, Council of. iv. 3.
Conventions of estates. i. 160, 191, 313, 385, 524.—ii. 114, 131, 135, 540.—iii. 108, 109, 376, 398-406.
Convention-parliament, and acts. iii. 405, 428, 429, 430-432, 466, 468, 472, 474, 476, 488, 489, 491, 494, 637.
Conventicles. ii. 507, 550, 603, 605, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 665, 676, 687, 689, 693, 694.—iii. 20, 45, 47, 61, 78, 101, 106, 107, 110, 136, 138, 140, 141, 170, 195, 196, 242, 260, 261, 308.
Convocation of England. iii. 628.—iv. 182, 211.
Coronation. i. 527.—ii. 337.
Council of the Church. i. 388, 391.
——— of Trent. i. 45.
———, letters from. ii. 445, 508, 585, 600.
Court of High Commission. i. 451, 460, 482.—ii. 527, 531.
Covenant, the. ii. 409.—iii. 283, 621, 622.
Covenanters. i. 571, 580.—ii. 2, 4, 5, 7, 15, 22, 41, 43, 45, 81, 96, 557.—iii. 43, 69, 154, 242, 396, 533.
Cowper, James. i. 357.
Craig, John. i. 287, 333, 357.
Craw, Paul. i. 3.
Crawford, earl of. iii. 405, 466, 467, 513, 518, 520, 530, 581.
Cromwell, Oliver. ii. 183, 216, 231, 232, 286, 322, 328, 331, 344, 350, 356, 362, 372, 374.
Cruden. iv. 606, 611.
——— Richard. ii. 375.—iv. 84.
Cumberland, duke of. iv. 321-324, 331.
Cammins, Faithful. ii. 241.

Dalkeith Castle. ii. 4.
Dalzell, sir Thomas. ii. 552, 559-564, 576.
Danby, earl of. iii. 131, 132.
Darnly, lord. i. 171.
Declarations. ii. 376, 377, 378.—iii. 357, 395.
Defender of the Faith. i. 15.
Declination of the bishops. ii. 21.
Denmark, Prince George. iv. 33.
Depositions. ii. 535, 537, 538, 539, 541.
Dickson, David. ii. 23, 31, 181, 232.
Dioceses. iv. Of Glasgow, 635-638—of Edinburgh, 638, 639—of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, 639—of Brechin, 640, 641—of Aberdeen, 641-643—of Moray, Ross, and Argyle, 643.
Directory. ii. 127, 152, 155, 251, 261.
Dispensation. iii. 291, 302, 316, 317, 326, 332, 590, 591. 638.
Dort, synod of. i. 500.
Douglass, John. i. 50, 128.
——— Robert. ii. 176, 183, 310, 377, 382-385, 386, 390, 402, 439, 442, 610, 622.
——— archbishop. i. 221, 232.
——— bishop. iii. 235, 253.—iv. 3, 133, 134.
Down and Connor, bishop of. iv. 385.
Doxology. i. 294.—ii. 110.
Drumclog. iii. 173, 175.

- Drummond, bishop. iii. 601.
 Dunfermline, earl of. ii. 34, 91, 98.
 ——— declaration. ii. 323, 324-328, 383, 390.
 Dunaverti. ii. 182.
 Dunbar, earl of. i. 463.
 ——— sir William. iv. 608.
 ——— bishop. iv. 121, 123, 131, 250, 268, 279, 280—death of, 351.
 Dunbarton Castle. i. 219.—ii. 5.
 Dunblane, bishop of. i. 630, 650.
 Duncan, bishop. iv. 207, 223, 224—death of, 268.
 Dundas, William Pitt, esq. ii. 489.
 Dundee, town of. i. 66.
 ——— viscount. iii. 457, 458.—death. 459, 460.
 Dunkeld, bishop of. i. 8, 627, 630.
 Dunmore, John. i. 542.
 Dury, John. i. 261, 304, 314, 412.
- Easter-day. i. 467, 489, 501, 502, 520, 540.
 Edgar, bishop. iv. 370.
 Edinburgh, bishop of. i. 537, 630, 649, 538, 539.
 ——— Castle. ii. 4, 16, 39.
 Eikon Basilike. ii. 92, 134, 149, 180, 194, 252, 273, 275, 285.
 Elizabeth, queen. i. 92, 210, 269, 320, 355, 358, 426.
 ——— of Bohemia. i. 390, 465, 466.
 Embassy to France. i. 41.
 Engagement. ii. 204, 212, 223, 231, 310.
 England, church of. i. 562.—ii. 91, 106, 451.
 English parliament. iii. 210, 212, 629.
 Enterprises, 1708. iv. 30, 31; 1715, 111-115; 1745, 317-324.
 Episcopal chest MSS. iii. 2, 3, 50-55, 142.
 Episcopacy. i. 123, 129, 141, 142, 251, 252, 253, 261, 262, 266, 283, 288, 291, 297, 409, 412, 628.—ii. 18, 19, 30, 90, 91, 100, 389, 390, 394, 401, 403, 412, 426, 428, 433, 438, 440, 461, 463, 608, 616, 649, 685.
 Erskine, John, of Dunn. i. 66.—Superintendent. i. 73, 101, 118, 119, 162, 223, 295, 342.
 ——— Ebenezer. iv. 265-267.
 Errol, earl of. i. 375, 377, 387, 442, 543.—iv. 453.
 Eternal decree, the. ii. 262.
 Excommunications. i. 374, 375, 463, 474, 650.—ii. 128, 136, 139, 168, 173, 177, 231.—iii. 493, 531.
 Exemption. i. 392.
 Exercises. i. 272, 286, 296.
 Extempore prayers. i. 139, 294, 644.
- Fairfoui, archbishop. ii. 179, 447, 459, 469, 487, 493, 517, 664.
 Falconar, Colin, bishop. iii. 190, 194, 267, 315.
 ——— John, bishop. iv. 38, 39, 93, 163, 169, 185—Death of, 206.
 ——— William. iv. 286—Primus, 377—resignation, 392.
 Fall, Dr. William. iii. 383, 519.
 Fasts. i. 182, 281, 306, 312, 372, 387, 392, 423, 502, 514, 521.—ii. 96, 108, 113, 134, 135, 145, 148, 154, 212, 234, 249, 257, 346, 365, 539, 552.—iii. 117, 441, 524, 535, 552-554, 621.—iv. 30, 31, 62, 231.
 Fergusson sermon. 231.
 Festivals. i. 260, 274, 295, 497.—ii. 154, 500, 509, 531, 533, 673, 674.
 Field meetings. ii. 507, 550.
 Fifty-five questions. i. 396-398.
 Fitzwilliam, rev. Dr. iii. 545.
 Fletcher, rev. David. ii. 470, 471, 523, 553.

- Forbes, Dr. of Corse.** ii. 137.
 ——— bishop. ii. 490.—iv. 377—death of, 391.
 ——— sir William. iv. 453, 465, 473, 476, 479—death of, 480.
Forrest, Henry. i. 7.—Thomas. i. 8.
Forrester, rev. ii. 683, 684, 695, 696.
Forster, General. iv. 112.
Freebairn, bishop. iv. 173, 177, 247—primus, 270—death of, 282, 283.
French Revolution. iv. 441, 442.
Friendly Society. iv. 438, 443.
Fullarton, bishop. iv. 7, 8, 159, 162, 170, 205, 209, 210, 216, 231, 233.—
 Death of, 242.

Gadderar, James, D.D. bishop. iv. 80, 148, 166, 179, 181, 202, 204, 205, 211,
 220, 235, 241—death of, 265.
Gaelic Episcopal Society. iv. 523, 541.
Galloway, bishop of. i. 101, 164, 168, 248, 627, 631, 653.
Garrioch Presbytery. iv. 593-594.
Geddes, Jenny. i. 552.
George I. iv. 107, 127—death of, 258.
 ——— II. iv. 259, 261—death of, 371.
 ——— III. iv. 371, 420, 484—death of, 498.
 ——— IV. iv. 501.
General Assembly. i. 151, 161, 163, 167, 170, 172, 173, 177, 182, 184, 190,
 200, 208, 210, 213, 215, 217, 218, 225, 228, 234, 246, 247, 249, 259, 260,
 266, 272, 274, 276, 281, 285, 289, 294, 301, 230, 228, 235, 271, 304, 308,
 313, 324, 326, 329, 331, 333, 338, 343, 372, 380, 382, 384, 385, 396, 399,
 402, 405, 411, 422, 424, 428, 437, 446, 477, 485, 489, 517.—ii. 23, 33,
 40, 65, 98, 106, 117, 127, 158, 151, 168, 171, 183, 222, 310, 321, 342, 356,
 358, 359, 364, 510.—iii. 8, 14, 55, 56, 522, 529-537, 570, 572-574, 586,
 591, 602-604, 608, 609, 614, 621, 627, 633, 644-646, 659.—iv. 8, 11, 28,
 33, 39, 62, 90, 97, 101, 109, 132, 148, 172, 181, 217, 250, 241, 257, 259,
 260, 265, 266, 281, 282, 331, 386, 448, 489, 496, 497, 500, 504, 508, 510,
 520, 522, 529, 603, 613, 614.
Gerard, bishop. iv. 331—death of, 384.
Gillan, bishop. iv. 232, 249—death of, 273.
Gillespie, Patrick. ii. 78, 323, 342, 343, 352, 358, 363, 373, 390.—George. ii.
 188, 191.
Gillon, Andrew. iii. 157, 246, 247.
Gladstane, archbishop. i. 404, 464, 466, 471.
Glasgow cathedral. i. 284.
 ——— archbishop of. i. 629, 630, 649, 655.
 ——— act of council. ii. 494, 610.
Gleig, George, LL.D., bishop. iv. 446—election, 482—consecration, 483—
 primus, 494, 495, 501, 507, 518, 534—resignation, 541—death, 575.
Glencairn, earl of. i. 189.—ii. 399, 433, 434, 533.
Glencoe, massacre of. iii. 574-577, 587, 596.
Gloucesterfrigate. iii. 236-239.
Godfathers and godmothers. i. 138.
Gordon, bishop. iii. 329, 601.
Gourlay, Norman. i. 7.
Gowrie conspiracy. i. 418, 420, 425.
Graham, bishop. iii. 195.
 ——— sir James. iv. 612, 613.
 ——— of Claverhouse. iii. 170, 173, 174, 268, 457.
Grant, Laird of. i. 50.
Greek church. iv. 148, 225-228.
Greenshields, Rev. James. iv. 34-38, 40-46, 47-50, 59-61, 66.
Greig, Rev. A. iv. 335-338, 344.

- Gunpowder plot. i. 430.
 Guthry, bishop. ii. 121, 179, 583.—iii. 68.
 Guthrie, James. ii. 329, 338, 342, 343, 352, 371, 399, 419-421.
- Habits, or surplice, ii. 238, 240.
 Habernfield, Andrew, archbishop. ii. 15.
 Hackston of Rathillet. iii. 150, 195, 201, 203, 247.
 Haddo, lord. ii. 143.
 Haliburton, bishop. ii. 470, 474, 535, 538.—iii. 68, 235.—iv. 3, 111
 Hall, Henry. ii. 667.—iii. 198, 199.
 Hamilton, Patrick. i. 4, 5.
 ——— Robert. iii. 171, 173, 174, 179
 ——— bishop. ii. 446, 449, 459, 524, 589, 635, 682.—iii. 7, 306
 ——— dukes. i. 410, 575, 576, 588, 590, 613-618, 621, 640.—ii. 8, 11, 75, 77, 98.—iii. 112, 133, 146, 176, 178, 181, 212, 218, 231, 304-306, 367.—iii. 43, 55, 78, 102, 188, 374, 428, 486, 488, 489, 615, 638.
 ——— archbishop. i. 37, 41, 43, 54, 55, 95, 97, 140, 158, 159, 160, 166, 219.
 Hampton Court. i. 432.—ii. 242.
 Hanover succession. iv. 6, 66.
 Harley, or Harlow. i. 47.
 Harper, rev. William. iv. 285, 290.
 Hatton, lord. ii. 642.—iii. 208, 219.
 Hay, sir John. i. 578.—ii. 73.
 ——— bishop. iii. 329.—iv. 3, 30.
 Head of the church. i. 15, 125.
 Henderson, Alexander. i. 553, 557, 559, 571, 579, 593, 618, 619, 630, 634.—ii. 13, 23, 26, 49, 66, 74, 78, 106, 117, 259, 279, 280, 281, 487.
 Henrietta Maria. i. 512.
 Henry VIII. i. 15, 16, 20, 24, 200, 201.
 ——— prince of Wales. i. 381, 465.
 Heresy. i. 26, 27.
 Heth, Thomas. ii. 242.
 Hierarchy. i. 122, 300.
 Hickes, George, D.D., bishop. iii. 18, 67, 79, 81, 92, 548, 550-552.—iv. 98, 167.
 Highland host. iii. 93, 95, 99.
 High commission, court of. iii. 302, 326, 338.
 Holy Spirit. i. 297.
 ——— Scripture. i. 24, 60, 136.
 Honeyman, bishop. ii. 457, 528, 531, 532, 572, 584, 598.—iii. 44.
 Hope, sir Thomas. i. 557, 584.
 Horsley, bishop. iv. 406, 428, 474, 478—death, 480.
 Hotham, sir John. ii. 56, 272.
 House garrisons, iii. 22.
 Huntly, earl of. i. 375, 377, 387, 410, 442, 473, 479.—ii. 56, 136, 193, 307, 351, 367.
- Idolatry. i. 62.
 Immorality. i. 104, 162, 163, 169.—ii. 315, 699.
 Innes, bishop. iv. 391.
 Inquisitor-general. i. 17—Interdict. i. 21.
 Independents. iv. 153, 356-358, 370-372, 425-428, 443, 463, 499, 521, 522, 591, 600-603.
 Indulgence. ii. 605, 608, 610, 611, 613, 621, 630, 635, 669.—iii. 50-55, 187, 196, 310, 328.
 Intercommuning, letters of. iii. 25, 46.
 Ireland, church of. ii. 82-85, 452.

Irish Rebellion. ii. 81-89.

Irvine, bishop. iv. 150, 183, 221—death of, 230.

Jales, bishop of. i. 629, 651.

Jacobites. iv. 67.

James, king, V. i. 7, 8, 16, 17.

—— VI. i. 181, 194, 222, 286, 293, 302, 312, 318, 319, 320, 333, 335, 339, 356, 388, 391, 392, 418, 420, 427, 428, 436, 439, 445, 449, 467, 479, 483, 488, 490—death of, 506-510—ii. 83.

—— II. and VII. iii. 275, 276, 277, 281, 291, 307, 319, 320, 346, 347-350, 351, 353, 407, 631-633, 426, 550, 551.

Jesuits. i. 332, 587.—ii. 51, 165, 662.—iii. 182, 183, 220, 301, 307, 313.—iv. 89, 172, 177.

Jesus Christ's commission. i. 141.

Johnston of Warriston. ii. 253, 380—execution, 514-515.

Jolly, Alexander, D.D., bishop. iv. 338, 446, 447, 448, 465, 495, 543—death of, 552-555.

Johnston of Warriston. i. 569, 578, 593, 623.—ii. 13, 49, 74, 111, 130, 158, 175, 181, 233, 380, 514-515.

Keith, bishop. iv. 250, 268, 277, 281—primus, 293, 295—letter, 305—letter, 313-315, 317, 362-364—death of, 365.

Kenn, bishop. iii. 288, 334, 336, 427, 543, 547.

Kennedy, James. i. 8.

Kilgour, bishop. iv. 384, 885—primus, 394, 399, 407—resignation, 415.

King, Mess John. iii. 21, 173, 181.

—— of France, letter. ii. 42, 277.

King's College, Aberdeen. ii. 3.

—— letters. ii. Charles II. 402, 443, 448, 524, 529, 577, 578, 579, 607, 619, 628, 653, 673, 676, 681, 691.—iii. 5, 10, 43, 102, 108, 143, 167, 181, 187, 192, 196, 216, 227.—James VII. 280, 291, 299, 304, 305, 308, 328, 344, 353, 356, 402.—William III. 472, 529, 531, 559, 563, 623.—Anne, 641, 644.

Kingsland's curates. iii. 115, 116, 128.

Kirk. i. 383, 385.

Kirkcaldy of Grange. i. 17, 131, 221, 237, 245, 369.

Knox, John. i. 5, 38, 47, 48, 51, 73, 106, 127, 140, 145, 155, 162, 166, 169, 177, 181, 217, 226, 233, 238.—his sons. i. 186.

Knox's Liturgy. i. 154, 135, 176.

Knoxian church. i. 191, 193, 206, 214.

Laing, Rev. William. iv. 385.

Lambert, general. ii. 219, 233, 355.

Lanerk, earl of. ii. 133, 141, 232.

Laud, archbishop. i. 527, 534, 537, 547, 622.—ii. 53, 61, 84, 236, 246, 247, 248, 249, 251.

Lauderdale, earl of. ii. 91, 141.

—— — duke of. ii. 230, 391, 394, 433, 434, 501, 527, 545, 530, 597, 618, 627, 638, 645, 658, 663, 666, 675, 684.—iii. 2, 4, 24, 43, 59, 62, 85, 109, 123, 125, 134, 188, 189, 201, 212, 242.

Laurie, bishop. ii. 663, 664.—iii. 68.

Lay-elders. i. 584, 614, 615, 616, 620.—ii. 93.

Law-borrows. iii. 96.

Lawson, John Parker. i. 2, 5, 47, 158.

Leighton, bishop. ii. 364, 447, 449, 460, 542, 595-598, 628, 632, 642, 643, 646, 647, 650, 652, 675, 681, 682.—iii. 4, 6, 187, 255.

Leith Assembly. i. 230, 228, 235, 271.

Leslie, bishop of Ross. i. 71, 150, 350, 401.

—— earl of Leven. ii. 2, 4, 7, 10, 47, 49, 73, 77, 133, 277.

- Leslie, general David. ii. 133, 157, 181, 323, 330, 478.
 ——— Rev. Dr. Charles. iv. 3, 4, 5, 176.
 Lenox, earl of. i. 24, 214, 216, 221, 222.—duke of. i. 286.
 Lethendy, case of. iv. 571.
 Libel on the bishops i. 585, 586.
 Lindore's, Lawrence. i. 2, 3.
 Lindsay, David. i. 357, 402, 410, 419.
 ——— lord. i. 393,
 ——— bishop. iii. 68, 140.
 Liturgy. i. 60, 134, 135, 176, 477, 535, 547, 548, 550, 552, 562, 578, 581.—
 iii. 197, 498, 515, 516.—iv. 28, 33, 51, 63-66, 74, 82, 89, 91, 120, 171.
 Livingstone, John. iii. 13, 14.
 Lochleven Castle. i. 189, 193, 208.
 London, fire and plague of. ii. 553, 554.
 Long Parliament. ii. 35, 50, 54, 65, 90, 96, 105, 115, 119, 133, 166, 172,
 174, 171, 202, 246, 249, 251, 256, 272, 277, 284, 286, 380.—Rump of.
 321.
 Lords of the articles. i. 94.
 Lorn, lord. i. 575.
 Loudon, earl of. i. 514, 559, 560.—ii. 13, 17, 34, 41, 42, 69, 72, 195, 231,
 307, 317, 368.
 Louisa-Maria, princess. iv. 83.
 Low, David, LL.D., bishop. iv. 398, 497, 523, 526, 528, 537, 540, 550.
 Lumsden, bishop. iv. 234, 256, 261, 263, 268—death of, 269.
 Lunan, Rev. Patrick. iv. 146.
 Luscombe, bishop. iv. 505-508, 529.
 Lyon, Rev. Robert. iv. 330.
 Lysimachus, Nicanor. ii. 166, 172, 561, 601.
- Mackenzie, bishop. ii. 470.—iii. 68, 329.
 Macfarlane, bishop. iv. 407, 411, 446—death, 497.
 Macintosh, rev. Donald. iv. 444.
 M'Crie, Dr. i. 38, 39, 44, 48, 187.
 Maclean, Hector, bishop. iii. 194.
 M'Kail, Hew. ii. 566-568, and note, 568, 569.
 Maitland, of Lethington. i. 88, 246, 369.
 ——— rev. John. iv. 137-139, 144, 146.
 Marks of the church. i. 144-146.
 Marr, earl of, regent. i. 223, 236.—iv. 111-114, 117, 118.
 Marnock, case of. iv. 572, 573, 591.
 Mary, queen, the bloody. i. 46, 58.
 ——— II. iii. 547, 594.
 ——— princess of Orange. i. 525.
 ——— queen of the Scots. i. 17, 22, 58, 85, 92, 150, 154, 171, 189, 193, 199,
 217, 284, 325, 348, 357.
 ——— queen regent. i. 39, 41, 46, 47, 49, 86, 89.
 Massacres. ii. 86-88, 158, 182.—iii. Glencoe, 574-577, 587, 596.
 Mather, Rev. iii. 625, 626.
 Maxwell, bishop. i. 547, 631, 652.—ii. 84.
 Maxwell, William, of Logan. ii. 144.
 Meldrum, George. iii. 648, 650.
 Melville, Andrew. i. 258, 260, 282, 302, 314, 322, 344, 386, 399, 402, 435.
 ——— James. i. 433, 463, 466.
 ——— earl of. iii. 186, 468, 473, 572.
 Methuen, Paul. i. 57, 66, 167.
 Middleton, earl of. ii. 212, 219, 334, 338, 345, 389, 391, 406, 407, 422, 432,
 433, 470, 492, 501-503.
 Mill, the rev. Walter. i. 55.
 Millar, Arthur, bishop. iii. 644.—iv. 150, 246—death, 254.

- Ministers, iv. 13, 71, 85, 242, 347, 392.
 ——— scarcity of. i. 102, 103.
 Mitchell, bishop. ii. 490, 508.
 Mitchell, James. ii. 598, 600, 686-689.—iii. 81-93.
 Moir, David, D.D. bishop. iv. 546, 547, 575.
 Moderatism. iv. 261, 380.
 Moderators, constant. i. 438, 448.
 Monastic orders. i. 2.
 Monck, general. ii. 350, 370, 376, 380.
 Monroe, Dr. iii. 149, 291, 468-470, 515-518, 540, 622.
 Montgomery, archbishop. i. 301, 304, 305, 306, 315.
 Monmouth, duke of. iii. 135, 176, 178, 180, 185, 189, 190, 243, 250, 287-289.
 Montrose, marquis of. i. 576, 641.—ii. 6, 17, 34, 44, 50, 61, 63, 96, 111, 144, 156, 167, 316, 317.
 Moray, bishop of. ii. 39.
 ——— earl of. i. 160, 193, 195, 214, 350, 207, 208, 367.
 Morton, earl of, regent. i. 237, 250, 268, 275, 303, 369.
 Munro, general. ii. 39, 50.
 Murray, William. ii. 98, 202.
- Napier, lord. ii. 193.
 Nevay, John. ii. 181, 182.
 Newcastle. ii. 47, 278.
 Nicolson, bishop. iv. 61, 112, 133-135.
 Nobility reconciled. i. 325.
 Non-jurors. iii. 546, 549.—iv. 129, 167, 168, 183.
 Norrie, bishop. iv. 203, 207, 222-224.
 Nuncio, the pope's. iii. 326.
- Oath of abjuration. iv. 85-88, 97, 135, 160, 437, 439.
 Oaths, supremacy and canonical obedience. i. 524, 525.
 ——— ii. 362, 380, 396, 408, 482, 485, 498, 552, 578, 581, 582, 641.
 Occasions. ii. 544.—iii. 45, 46.—iv. 9, 10, 260.
 Ochterlonie, bishop. iv. 233, 235, 240—death of, 286.
 Oglevie, John. i. 467.
 Orange, prince of. iii. 340, 344, 346, 351, 352, 375, 399, 401, 405.
 Ordination. i. 403.
 Orkney, bishop of. ii. 24.
 ——— duke of. i. 189, 368.
 Oxford parliament. ii. 140, 274.
 ——— University. iii. 247, 248, 326, 327.
- Palmer, Rev. William. i. 244.
 Papists. 209, 287.
 Parliament. i. 13, 48, 58, 92, 172, 195, 225, 245, 288, 315, 320, 325, 331, 378, 404, 432, 444, 465, 480, 502, 516, 519, 528.—ii. 33, 38, 50, 60, 69, 141, 151, 155, 156, 157, 160, 176, 199, 202, 204, 215, 234, 317, 318, 407, 421, 474, 483, 484, 491, 510, 516, 614, 618, 623, 638, 666.—iii. 216, 280, 296, 299, 301, 303, 468, 582, 596, 606, 610, 623, 624, 626, 637, 641, 647.—iv. 6, 10, 13, 425.
 ——— acts of. i. 13, 14, 25, 315.—ii. 97, 236, 288, 331.—iii. 217, 282, 286, 587, 598, 599, 600, 611, 626, 651.
 Patronage. ii. 102, 413, 415, 312, 482.—iii. 481, 482, 511.—iv. 81, 91-93, 110, 346-349, 386-388.
 Patterson, bishop John. ii. 470, 653-658.—iii. 7, 26, 50-55, 103-105, 128, 140, 219, 226.—archbishop. 315, 581, 626.
 ——— archbishop. iv. 3—death of, 34.
 Paternoster. i. 43.

- Pearson, rev. Petre. iii. 267, 466.
 Peers of England, letter from. ii. 136.
 Persecution. iii. 209, 210, 525-529, 625, 653-659.—iv. 3, 11, 31, 118, 120-127.
 Perth. i. 29, 73, 75.
 — synod of. i. 439.
 Perth articles. i. 492, 498, 500, 501, 502, 504, 514, 581.
 Petitions. i. 165, 174, 518, 520, 524, 531, 542, 558.—ii. 11, 28, 97, 139, 160, 429, 697.—iii. 333, 383, 407, 472, 474, 479, 483, 523, 565, 640, 642, 656.—iv. 14, 73.
 Petrie, bishop. iv. 378, 389, 390—death of, 407-409.
 Petre, father. iii. 308, 327, 332, 338, 348.
 Phillipshaugh. ii. 157, 161.
 Pinkey, battle of. i. 46.
 Pont, Robert. i. 247, 248, 302, 305, 316, 391.
 Pope. i. 197, 200.
 Popish clergy. i. 1, 213.
 — plots. iii. 117, 129, 134—Meal-tub, 192.
 — bill. iv. 511-515.
 Posture, act of. ii. 204.
 Prayers to the saints. i. 43.
 Prelates, deaths of. i. 25, 26.
 Predestination. i. 99, 298.
 Presbyterians. i. 550, 551, 557.—iii. 357, 360, 377, 385, 398, 403, 408, 438, 503, 508, 554, 655.
 Presbyterian inquisition. iii. 514, 515, 518, 519, 521, 525-529, 657.
 — establishment. iv. 27, 392.
 — ministers. ii. 504, 505, 535, 541, 544, 550, 560, 561, 564, 643, 647, 649, 671, 672, 685, 693.—iii. 11-14, 21, 55, 57, 60, 170, 185, 186, 188, 192, 318, 319, 328, 332, 340, 385, 389, 432, 439, 460, 472, 522-524, 555, 572, 574, 583.
 Presbyteries. i. 167, 537, 256, 258, 260, 266, 267, 290, 286, 295, 296, 298, 299, 303, 305, 309.—iv. 37, 111, 121-127, 129, 131, 136-141-146.
 Presbyterianism. i. 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 422, 456.—ii. 439, 467-469.—iii. 463, 476, 482, 490, 532, 533, 594, 647, 651.
 Presbytery, the four pleas of. iii. 447-449, 450, 451.
 Pretender. iv. 151.
 Primus Scotiæ Episcopus. iv. 2, 3, 262, 270, 293, 368, 377, 415, 477.
 Primrose. iii. 82.
 Prince of Wales. iii. 532, 339, 348, 629.
 Privy council, and acts of. ii. 442, 491, 495, 515, 600, 616, 633, 635, 669, 674, 687.—iii. 63, 65, 66, 78, 96, 117, 126, 139, 166, 226, 234, 256, 263, 264, 315, 359, 433, 466, 535, 554.
 Proclamations. i. 567, 581.—ii. 12, 14, 131, 148, 467, 486, 491, 531, 542, 549, 559, 562, 600, 603, 689, 693.—iii. 46, 77, 96, 117, 136, 142, 167, 175, 187, 247, 257, 265, 278, 309, 316, 328, 330, 332, 338, 359, 383, 392, 407-412, 416, 436, 440, 441, 458, 464, 552.—iv. 13, 33, 107-108, 109, 176, 276.
 Processions. iv. 4, 5.
 Protestants. i. 27, 97.
 Provincial councils. i. 27, 39, 40, 43, 45, 56.
 Prynne, Bastwick, Burton. ii. 245, 247, 248.
 Puritans. ii. 37, 68, 108, 236, 239, 242, 255, 270.

 Queensbury, duke of. iii. 281.

 Rabbling. iii. 358, 360-371, 375, 379-382 388, 397, 398, 408, 413-419, 432, 443, 465, 568, 562.
 Raid of Ruthven. i. 307, 311, 312, 313.
 Raitt, bishop. iv. 91, 287—death of, 391.

- Rattray, Dr. Thomas, bishop. iv. 168, 186-201, 223, 235, 248, 256, 278 —
primus, 284—death of, 290-292.
- Rebellion. 558-565.—iii. 62.
- Reformation. i. 201, 203.
- Regalia. ii. 355, 406.
- Ramsay, bishop. ii. 179.—iii. 6, 8, 10, 11, 28-31, 34, 35-38-40, 253, 300,
604.
- Rankine, bishop. iv. 249—death of, 259.
- Regents. i. 207, 208, 214, 367, 216, 221, 222, 223, 236, 237, 250, 268, 275,
303, 369.
- Registers of Assembly. i. 593, 595, 612.
- Remarks. i. 10, 34, 59-64, 101-104, 105-148, 200-205, 253-255, 347,
413-416, 452-458, 507-510, 562-564, 634-636, 655.—ii. 43, 92-94,
147-149, 219-221, 234, 270, 346-349, 396, 423-425, 461-465, 518-522,
569-575, 601, 658-661, 700.—iii. 11-19, 68-76, 117-124, 144-146, 182-184,
204-208, 229, 248-252, 291, 321-324, 353-355, 388-391, 419-425, 453-456,
478-480, 494, 511, 538-542, 577-579, 615-620.—iv. 20-26, 58, 102-105,
155-158, 211-215, 243-245, 254, 255, 269, 315, 316, 338-343, 365-367,
376, 392, 393, 415-418, 433, 449-451, 468-470, 489-493, 515-517, 541-542,
553, 582-584, 604.
- Remonstrators. ii. 335, 336, 342, 532, 353, 365, 366, 371, 397, 427, 455,
501, 303.
- Remonstrances. ii. 113, 155, 160, 203, 213, 215, 221, 225, 346, 309, 614, 616,
670, 697.—iv. 14, 17, 81, 183, 238.
- Renwick, James. iii. 245, 261, 278, 318, 328, 330, 331.
- Report on episcopacy. i. 262.
- Republican spirit. i. 133.
- Rescissory act. ii. 410, 411, 423, 466.—iii. 429, 477, 492.
- Resolutioners. ii. 335, 367, 371, 373, 397, 439, 455.
- Restoration. ii. 398.
- Richelieu, card. i. 549, 568, 638.—ii. 85.
- Riding of parliament. i. 195.—ii. 73, 517.
- Rizzio, David. i. 180.
- Rome, church of. i. 1, 28, 42.
- Rose, Alexander, bishop. iii. 316, 329.—letter, 371-373, 376-379, 401, 444,
445.—iv. 1, 3, 27, 57, 59, 93, 130, 153, 136, 150, 153—death of, 154.
— bishop James. iv. 233, 235, 240—death of, 268.
— bishop Charles. iv. 389—death of, 428.
- Ross, archbishop. iii. 253, 255, 275, 277, 293, 294, 303, 325, 328, 341, 342,
356, 392, 426, 457, 481, 496, 513, 543, 580, 621, 661-663.
- Roths, earl and duke of. i. 514, 526, 528, 559, 579, 620.—ii. 13, 15, 34, 36,
502, 533, 559, 566, 578, 585, 604, 650.—iii. 84, 281, 293.
- Rough, John. i. 19, 26, 37, 38.
- Royal exile. iv. 177, 201, 211, 218, 221, 228, 229, 233, 234—death of, 390.
- Russell, Jeremy. i. 8.
— Dr. Michael, bishop. iv. 525, 526, 546, 547, 559, 586, 597, 599.
— lord William. iii. 210.
- Rutherglen. iii. 172.
- Rutherford, Samuel. i. 574.—ii. 309, 321.
- Ryehouse plot. iii. 243-245, 257-260, 283, 290.
- Sacheverell, Dr. iv. 52-57, 99.
- Sacrilege. ii. 255 —iv. 5, 12, 347.
- Safe conduct. iv. 4.
- Sage, bishop. i. 68, 246.—ii. 281, 282.—iii. 604-606.—iv. 7, 68-70.
- Sale of the king. ii. 175, 178, 179.
- Salmasius. i. 127.
- Sanquhar declarations. iii. 200 — Renwick's, 261, 279 — Cameronians, 652.
- Sancroft, archbishop. iii. 276, 303, 333, 336, 338, 427, 543, 547, 588, 594.

- Sandford, Dr. Daniel, bishop. iv. 464, 471, 473, 475, 477, 478, 479, 504—
death of, 518.
- Scandalous ministers. ii. 253.
- Scoon, lord. i. 440.
- abbey of. i. 82.
- Scotch commissioners. ii. 247, 258, 284.
- Scougal, bishop. ii. 531.—iii. 222, 226, 235.
- Scripture, canon of. i. 453, 454, 462.
- Scroggie, bishop. ii. 553.
- Seabury, bishop. iv. 397, 399—consecration, 400 402-406, 409.
- Seasonable warnings. ii. 153, 177, 183, 224, 225, 310, 312.
- Secession, the. iv. 265, 267, 275, 282, 333, 349-352, 388.
- Session, Court of. i. 516, 578.
- Seven bishops. iii. 333-337, 394, 547.
- Shaftesbury, earl of. iii. 107, 179, 229, 249.
- Sharp, archbishop. ii. 344, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 377, 380, 381-387, 389,
393, 395, 407, 413, 435, 442, 447, 449, 455, 459, 466, 469, 470, 473-477,
488, 502, 525, 526, 529, 531, 534, 538, 544, 576, 577, 585, 590, 598, 603,
611, 662, 673, 690, 693.—iii. 2, 8, 9, 31-34, 77, 81, 85, 88, 106, 137, 138,
—murder, 147-165.
- Shotts, kirk of. i. 523.
- Skene, rev. iii. 562, 563.
- Skinner, rev. John. iv. 52, 325, 326, 354, 378—death of, 480.
- bishop John. ii. 450.—iv. 294, 379, 391—consecration, 395, 407—
primus, 419, 435, 443, 445, 452, 455, 456, 460-468, 471, 476—death of, 489.
- bishop Wm. D.D. iv. 495, 525, 534, 557, 565—primus, 585, 587, 605.
- Smythe, Mrs. of Methven. iii. 111-113, 137.
- Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. iv. 498, 500, 504, 564, 565, 580,
586, 587, 605.
- Solemn League and Covenant. i. 568, 570, 571.—ii. 82, 116, 120, 123, 179,
200, 258, 259, 287, 302, 303, 409, 479, 487, 500, 560, 561.—iii. 70, 398,
537.
- Sophia, princess. iii. 630.—iv. 100.
- Spanish armada. i. 328.
- Spalato, archbishop of. i. 479.
- Spottiswood, Sir Robert. i. 543, 578.—ii. 73, 157, 159, 161—execution, 163.
- ——— superintendent. i. 100, 127, 320.
- ——— archbishop. i. 426, 428, 432, 449, 472, 474, 487, 502, 514, 517,
522, 527, 544, 552, 567, 568, 573, 586, 627, 630, 646-649.
- Stephen, Rev. John. iv. 453 456, 457-460.
- Stewart, Rev. Walter. iv. 364.
- lord James. i. 78, 150.
- Stirling. i. 222.
- Strachan, bishop (David). ii. 491, 663.
- ——— rev. Dr. ii. 412, 519.
- ——— bishop. iv. 411—death of, 484.
- Strafford, earl of. ii. 36, 48, 53.
- Strathbogie. iv. 579-580, 591-593.
- St. Andrews, city of. i. 80.
- ——— University of. ii. 72, 78, 516.
- St. Bartholomew massacre. i. 237.
- St. Paul's, Aberdeen. iv. 503.
- Stuart, John. ii. 63.
- Superintendents. i. 100, 108, 110, 111, 112-119, 152, 161, 167, 168, 179,
197, 208, 212, 214, 224, 227, 234, 250.
- Supremacy. iv. 172, 217.
- Sydserf, bishop. i. 627, 631, 653.—ii. 446, 460, 516.

ERRATA.

VOLUME I.

Page	Line	
37	12	for raised, read <i>rase</i> .
59	2	" caviata, " <i>caveats</i> .
61	21	" noiblity, " <i>nobility</i> .
72	16	" fockless, " <i>fockless</i> .
129	31	" amy, " <i>army</i> .
134	22	" ad, " <i>and</i> .
144	35	insert <i>the</i> .
152	10	for dum-dogs, " <i>dumb-dogs</i> .
179	27	" or, " <i>and</i> .
184	24	" assembly, " <i>assembly</i> .
188	22	" consecra- " <i>consecra-</i> tion, <i>tion</i> .
225	19	" lord-regis- " <i>lord-regis-</i> trar, <i>ter</i> .
261	last l.	" notthe, " <i>not the</i> .
277	9	" corruptions, " <i>corrections</i> .
284	16	" ne er, " <i>never</i> .
293	13	" Basilican, " <i>Basilicon</i> .
329	16	read, rashly <i>and</i> <i>unadvisedly</i> .
362	1	for fore ver, read <i>for ever</i> .
364	4	from bottom, for bo thber, read <i>both her</i> .
397	19	for whic his, read <i>which is</i> .
398	3	from bottom, for tupitudinem, read <i>turpitudinem</i> .
416	31	for any, read <i>every</i> .
454	15	insert <i>with</i> , before order.
456	2	for hannel, read <i>channel</i> .
473	29	" leven " <i>leaven</i> .
476	last l.	" perceiv, " <i>perceive</i> .
485	1	" persecutor, " <i>persecutor</i> .
587	26	" io, " <i>to</i> .
589	19	" restriction, " <i>restriction,</i>

VOLUME II.

54	15	for marquis, read <i>earl</i> .
166	3	" that, " <i>but</i> .
220	32	" obstanti, " <i>obstante</i>
224	35	" heir, " <i>their</i> .
253	77	" turnedin, " <i>turned in</i> .
254	36	" commen- " <i>commen-</i> dums, <i>dams</i> .
271	14	" deignation, " <i>designation</i> .
284	14	" wel;l, " <i>well;</i>
332	34	<i>dele</i> who.
340	22	for fo, " <i>of</i> .
347	22	" usully, " <i>usually</i> .
355	4	" calumniarii, " <i>calumniari</i> .
361	21	" profanitiy, " <i>profanity</i> .
366	11	" declamation, " <i>reclamation</i>
380	28	" trator, " <i>traitor</i> .
391	5	" they, " <i>pity</i> .
392	32	" revolutioner, " <i>resolutioner</i>

Page Line

416	28	for octain, read <i>certain</i> .
427	29	" 1787, " <i>1687</i> .
459	35	" protestate, " <i>poleslate</i> .
490		transpose two last lines of note.
596	41	" pharasee, " <i>pharisee</i> .
647	34	" crafy, " <i>crafty</i> .
680	26	" Carstairs, " <i>Carstares</i> .
700	24	" tubulence, " <i>turbulence</i> .

VOLUME III.

75	6	" on, " <i>from</i> .
84	7	" gaolor, " <i>gaoler</i> .
91	1	" ou, " <i>out</i> .
92	last line,	ladie, " <i>ladies</i> .
116	37	" ot, " <i>of</i> .
128	8	" Kirklands, " <i>Kinglands</i> .
167	14	<i>dele</i> as.
175	34	" stadnard, " <i>standard</i> .
171	5	" Kirklands, " <i>Kinglands</i> .
188	38	" m lignity, " <i>malignity</i> .
219	2 fr.	foot, for to, " <i>at</i> .
374	23	" clest, " <i>eldest</i> .
449	9	" liquantes, culicem, read <i>liquantes culicem</i> ,
417	26	" Eglantine, " <i>Eglanton</i> .
473	21	" clauses, " <i>causes</i> .
455	last line,	for assort, " <i>assert</i> .
488	5 fr.	foot, for aird, " <i>laird</i> .
499	2	" he, " <i>the</i> .
459	7	" north, " <i>south</i> .
599	3	<i>dele</i> all.
632	28	" choloric, " <i>choleric</i> .

VOLUME IV.

80	last l.	notes, for Truths, read <i>Truth</i> .
120	11	" dare, " <i>dared</i> .
131	8	" ski, " <i>skin</i> .
133	head line,	for 1617, " <i>1717</i> .
154	29	" o, " <i>of</i> .
180	last line,	for the " <i>he</i> .
219	36	<i>dele</i> several.
226	10	" patriachs, " <i>patriarchs</i> .
221	head line,	for 1717, " <i>1727</i> .
316	11	" thelr, " <i>their</i> .
317	12	" Songhaven, " <i>Stonehaven</i>
323	24	" Cullen, " <i>Inverness</i> .
332	30	" heretable, " <i>heritable</i> .
361	below last line of note,	add <i>Trials</i> .
375	24	<i>dele</i> but.
380	33	" was, " <i>were</i> .
403	33	" he could, " <i>could he</i> .
431	4	" scriptural, " <i>spiritual</i> .
444	34	" Hay, " <i>Ilay</i> .

13
42

